DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 230 503 SP 022 265

AUTHOR Ward, Beatrice A.; And Others
TITLE Students' Experience during and Response to Transition to Junior High School. Junior High School Transition Study, Volume IV.
INSTITUTION Far West Lab. for Educational Research and Development, San Francisco, Calif.
SPONS AGENCY National Inst. of Education (ED), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE Jun 82
CONTRACT 400-80-01-03
NOTE 143p.; For related documents, see SP 022 256, SP 022 258, and SP 022 260-267.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Statistical Data (110)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Academic Achievement; Classroom Environment; Elementary Education; *Elementary School Students; Grade 6; Grade 7; Junior High Schools; *Junior High School Students; Middle Schools; Peer Relationship; School Effectiveness; *Student Adjustment; Student Attitudes; Student Behavior; Student Characteristics; Student Needs; *Student Participation; Student School Relationship; Student Teacher Relationship

ABSTRACT

This volume, part of the Junior High School Transition Study, reports on findings regarding one of five areas of interest in the study. Questions being addressed are: (1) How do students participate in, and respond to, junior high school instruction? (2) Do students respond differently in different circumstances? and (3) Are these differences, if any, related to the success of students' transition to junior high school? The data base for this report includes case descriptions of 24 target students whose progress was followed from their sixth-grade classes in elementary school to their seventh-grade classes in junior high school. The first chapter provides an introduction to the study, part of the Ecological Perspectives for Successful Schooling Practice project. Findings are reported in chapter 2, as are the four criteria for judging students' success in transition in chapter 3. The fourth chapter details research methodology, study participants, and data collection and analysis. Fifteen tables accompany the text. (JM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED230503

JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL TRANSITION STUDY

Volume IV: Students' Experience During and Response to Transition to Junior High School

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Jeremy A. George
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

Beatrice A. Ward
Thomas S. Rounds
Martin J. Packer
John R. Mergendoller
William J. Tikunoff

June 1982

SP022 245

Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development
1855 Folsom Street
San Francisco, CA 94103

The authors wish to acknowledge the support of the National Institute of Education, Department of Education, under NIE Contract 400-80-01-03 to the Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development, San Francisco, California. The opinions expressed herein do not necessarily reflect the position or policy of the Institute and no official endorsement by the National Institute of Education should be inferred.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The major purposes of the Junior High Transition Study are (1) to provide information about teaching and learning in the junior high/middle school, with special emphasis on the transition process, and (2) to make recommendations regarding teaching practices that help students move successfully from elementary to secondary school. The study was conducted in a single junior high school and the elementary schools from which the students came.

This volume reports the findings regarding one of five areas of interest in the study. The questions being addressed are: How do students participate in, and respond to, junior high school instruction? Do students respond differently in different circumstances? Are these differences, if any, related to the success of students' transition to junior high school?

The data base for this report includes case descriptions of 24 target students who were followed from their sixth-grade classes in elementary school to their seventh-grade classes in junior high school. Data were collected during the first five weeks of junior high school and again in November, at the time report cards were distributed for the first quarter of the school year. Using six student participation categories developed by Ward, Tikunoff, Lash, Rounds, and Mergendoller (1981), target students were selected who had been described by their sixth-grade teachers as participating in elementary school instruction in five different ways. These are: (1) success/multitask, (2) social, (3) dependent, (4) phantom, and (5) alienate.

Findings regarding the target students' participation in grade seven indicate that, first, most of the students appear to have evidenced participation characteristics in grade seven that were similar to those they were rated as exhibiting in grade six. Second, the students who seemed to show the greatest variation in their participation characteristics across the seventh-grade classes in which they were observed were those who were rated as dependent participants in grade six. In particular, the participation of these students seemed to be affected by the type of rule system the teacher established more than that of the other students. In classrooms where the teacher allowed little or no interaction among students, these target students often became phantom participants. Third, although the target students who were rated as social participants in grade six generally continued to exhibit social characteristics, several of them also were rated as success participants in grade seven. Fourth, the students who seemed to show the least tendency to modify their pattern of participation in grade seven were those who were rated as alienate participants in grade six.

Students' success in transition to junior high school was judged for each target student based on four criteria: (1) academic achievement as measured by the fall quarter grade assigned to the student by the teacher in the various classes in which the student was observed; (2) the student's academic behavior in the classroom, e.g., engagement in academic tasks and accuracy of responses to teacher's questions during class recitations; (3) response to classroom rules and norms; and (4) relationships with others. In addition, an overall success in transition rating was given each student based on the raters' general perceptions of the student's success.

Across the 24 target students it is clear that more of the students were successful or moderately successful in their transition to junior high school than unsuccessful. Students who were described by their seventh-grade teachers as success, social, or social/success students were most successful. None of these students received an unsuccessful total transition rating. In contrast, students who were described as alienate participants were largely unsuccessful. These students received unsuccessful total transition ratings in 71 percent of the classes in which they were observed. They were rated as successful in only 7 percent of the classes.

Students who were described as dependents and dependent/phantoms also appeared to have problems with the transition. They were rated as unsuccessful in 50 percent of the classes in which they were observed. The classes in which they were successful were the ones in which the teacher established a set of rules and norms that was flexible; e.g., allowed students to interact with one another and to initiate interaction with the teacher, so long as the conversations did not disturb others. Apparently these students needed to be able to interact with the teacher and other students in order to remain on-task and complete work successfully. It is interesting to note that, although one would expect that teacher accessibility also would be important to these students' success, the data suggest that accessible teachers in classrooms with rigid rule systems were not sought out by the students, and apparently the students were not contacted frequently enough by the teacher to receive the help and feedback they needed.

Students who were described as phantom and phantom/isolate participants in their seventh-grade classes made a successful transition in approximately half the classes in which they were observed. They were rated moderately successful in another 12 percent and unsuccessful in 35 percent.

Based on the student participation data reported here, it is clear that students who exhibit dependent, dependent/phantom, phantom, and phantom/isolate participation characteristics in grade seven require instructional settings in which teachers are accessible to students, establish and enforce classroom rules and norms that allow some student interaction with other students, focus on the interests and needs of students rather than coverage of subject matter content, and are clear in their explanations of content and procedures. They are the students who appear to be most vulnerable if they are placed

in an instructional setting in which the rule system is rigid, the teacher is unclear, and/or the teacher is not accessible. Social and success students make successful transitions regardless of the classes to which they are assigned. Alienate students seem to be largely unsuccessful no matter which instructional features are present in the class.

Thus, given limited resources (i.e., teachers and time), it appears that junior high/middle school staffs would be well advised to exert whatever special efforts are needed to assist students in their transition to secondary school, through careful selection of the classes to which certain students are assigned, in order to assure that the instructional features will be present that are necessary to aid these students in being successful participants in the junior high school education program. Since approximately 25 percent of the student population entering a junior high/middle school can be expected to be dependent participants and another 10 percent, or so, phantom participants, the portion of the students who could be expected to benefit from such attention is sizeable.

JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL TRANSITION STUDY

Volume IV: Students' Experience During and Response to Transition to Junior High School

Beatrice A. Ward
Thomas S. Rounds
Martin J. Packer
John R. Mergendoller
William J. Tikunoff

June 1982

Far West Laboratory for
Educational Research and Development
1855 Folsom Street
San Francisco, CA 94103

PREFACE

This volume is one in a series of reports of a multifaceted study that examined and described students' transition from elementary school (sixth grade) to a secondary school setting (seventh grade). It reports work conducted by the Ecological Perspectives of Successful Schooling Practices Program at the Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development. The volumes in the series include:

Volume I: Overview of the Junior High School Transition Study

Volume II: Organization of Instruction: Elementary School-Junior High School Comparison

Volume III: Student Perceptions of Transition and School

Volume IV: Student Experience During and Response to Transition to Junior High School

Volume V: Student Definitions of Teachers

Volume VI: Parent Concerns Regarding Transition to Junior High School

Volume VII: A Study of the Transition to Junior High School: Summary of the Findings and Implications for Provision of Successful Transition Experiences for All Students

The Ecological Perspectives for Successful Schooling Practices Program is one of a series of long-term, innovative efforts to improve educational opportunities for all children and youth funded by the National Institute of Education, U. S. Department of Education. Dr. Beatrice A. Ward and Dr. William J. Tikunoff are the co-principal investigators. Other professional staff members include Dr. John R. Mergendoller, program director; Dr. Alexis L. Mitman, asssociate research analyst, and Mr. Thomas S. Rounds, associate research scientist.

We wish to thank Dr. Virginia Koehler and Mr. Michael Cohen, Teaching and Learning Division, National Institute of Education, for their support of the Ecological Perspectives Program and, more specifically, the Junior High School Transition Study reported here. Their willingness to explore innovative ways of approaching the problems that confront educators and their encouragement of educational excellence are appreciated.

We also wish to thank the principals, teachers, students, and parents who collaborated with us in the conduct of this transition study. Their willingness to inquire into and analyze the multiple features of their instructional programs and the students' experiences in these programs made it possible to carry out the in-depth inquiry reported in the volumes listed above. Together, we learned much about successful transition experiences for students.

The school district assistant superintendent merits special recognition. He not only contributed data collected by the school district to the study data base, he also participated in discussion and interpretation of many of the findings.

Many individuals helped in the preparation of this particular report. Dr. Donald Swarthout, now of the Charlotte, North Carolina School District, directed the sixth-grade phase of the study. Dr. John R. Mergendoller, directed the seventh grade phase. Mr. Thomas S. Rounds, Ms. Christine Baker, Mr. Martin Packer, Ms. Nora Luke, Ms. Evelyn Ickes, Ms. Sahedran Satizan, and Ms. Phair Brand collected data in the seventh-grade classes. Dr. Beatrice A. Ward supervised the data analysis, which was conducted by Mr. Rounds. Mr. Rounds and Dr. Ward took primary responsibility for conceptualizing this report and shared writing responsibilities with Mr. Packer. Ms. Barbara Murray supervised and directed the effort of the support staff who prepared this manuscript. Mr. Charlie Ray Altizer was responsible for final editing and production of this volume. To all, thank you.

Beatrice A. Ward
William J. Tikunoff
John R. Mergendoller

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Executive Summary i

Preface vii

List of Tables xi

Chapter One: INTRODUCTION 1.1

Theoretical Framework Upon Which Student Transition Analysis Is Based 1.4

Successful Transition 1.19

The Junior High School in Which the Transition Study was Conducted 1.21

Conclusion 1.23

Chapter Two: FINDINGS REGARDING TARGET STUDENTS' PARTICIPATION IN JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL CLASSES . . . 2.1

Target Student Data Base 2.1

Student Participation Characteristics 2.8

Students Rated as Alienate Participants in Grade Six 2.9

Students Rated as Phantom Participants in Grade Six 2.16

Students Rated as Dependent Particpants in Grade Six 2.22

Students Rated as Social Participants in Grade Six 2.39

Students Rated as Success/ Mulititask Participants in Grade Six 2.48

Conclusion 2.57

Chapter Three: TARGET STUDENTS' SUCCESS IN TRANSITION TO JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL 3.1

Student Success in Transition to Junior High School Based on Participation Characteristics in Grade Six 3.3

Success of Students Rated as Alienate Participants in Grade Six 3.3

Success of Students Rated as Phantom Participants in Grade Six 3.7

Success of Students Rated as Dependent Participants in Grade Six 3.11

Success of Students Rated as
Social Participants in Grade Six 3.16

Success of Students Rated as
Success/Multitask Participants in Grade Six 3.19

Summary 3.22

Success of Target Student Transition to Junior High School
Based on Participation Characteristics in Grade Seven . . . 3.24

Conclusion and Relationship of Findings to Other Research . . 3.27

Chapter Four: SETTING, STUDY PARTICIPANTS, AND METHODOLOGY . . 4.1

Study Participants 4.2

Phase I 4.2

Phase II 4.2

Data Collection and Analysis 4.6

Phase I 4.6

Phase II 4.8

Summary 4.15

References R-1

LIST OF TABLES

1.1 Student Participation Categories and Characteristics Within Categories 1.13

2.1 Presence of Instructional Features That Differentiated Among Students' Learning Experiences in Seventh-Grade Classes 2.7

2.2 Seventh Grade Participation Categories of Target Students Rated as Alienate Participants in Sixth Grade 2.9

2.3 Seventh Grade Participation Categories of Target Students Rated as Phantom Participants in Sixth Grade 2.17

2.4 Seventh Grade Participation Categories of Target Students Rated as Dependent Participants in Sixth Grade 2.24

2.5 Seventh Grade Participation Categories of Target Students Rated as Social Participants in Sixth Grade 2.39

3.1 Transition Success of Target Students Rated as Alienated Participants in Grade Six 3.4

3.2 Transition Success of Target Students Rated as Phantom Participants in Grade Six 3.8

3.3 Transition Success of Target Students Rated as Dependent Participants in Grade Six 3.12

3.4 Transition Success of Target Students Rated as Social Participants in Grade Six 3.17

3.5 Transition Success of Target Students Rated as Success/Multitask Participants in Grade Six 3.20

3.6 Percentage of Target Students Rated as Successful in Transition to Junior High School Based on Participation Characteristics in Grade Seven 3.25

4.1 Sixth-Grade School and Teacher Sample and Data Collection in Which They Participated in Study 4.3

4.2 Classes in Which Phase II Teachers Were Observed 4.4

4.3 Seventh-Grade Teacher Sample Participation in Data Collection 4.10

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

Lounsbury, Marani, and Compton (1980) estimated that on a given school day in 1977, five million seventh-graders attended school in America. Multiplying this number by the three or four grades typically placed in junior high/middle schools, one can surmise that some 15-20 million students currently are enrolled in these "in-between" schools. Because of the unique characteristics of the student age group that is served, the historical reasons for establishing such schools, and the current trend toward provision of a middle school as opposed to a junior high school education program, the context in which these schools function differs markedly from that which surrounds elementary school or high school education.

The Education Research Services (1977) brief summarizing research on middle schools describes students ages 10-14 as "inbetweenagers," "early adolescents," and "transescents." Eichhorn (1980) uses the term "transescence" to refer to "the stage of development that begins prior to the onset of puberty and extends through the early stages of adolescence" (p. 59). He notes that since puberty does not occur for all precisely at the same chronological age, "the transescent designation is based on many physical, social, emotional, and intellectual changes that occur throughout these developmental stages" (p. 59).

Lounsbury, et al. (1980) suggest that seventh-graders are representative of the sorts of youngsters one would find in a junior high or middle school. In portraying these students, they state:

> Describing "the" seventh-grader is an impossible task for seventh-graders come in many sizes and shapes, with a variety of ethnic and religious backgrounds, interests, likes and dislikes, and hopes for the future. Their stages of maturation are so varied; some are childlike without any outward indication of the physical changes which will soon transform them into true adolescents. Others already possess mature physiques and are capable of producing children. Some are weathering the maturation process with ease, while others writhe and struggle like butterflies emerging from tattered cocoons . . . The seventh grade, therefore, is a true paradox. These youngsters are alike mainly in their unlikeness, with differences not only from one

another but within themselves, often from one day to the next. (p. 4)

Nonetheless, one can assume most students will undergo a similar set of developmental changes some time between ages 10 and 14. An obvious growth spurt will occur and secondary sexual characteristics will develop. The importance of peers will increase. Interactions with and acceptance by the peer group into which the student aspires to membership will receive high priority. Reliance on adult opinion and authority will decrease. Ability to deal with abstract as well as concrete concepts may develop, although Epstein and Toepfer (1978) challenge this view because of their own studies suggesting that brain growth slows between ages 12 and 14.

Consequently, middle and junior high schools serve students during an important and unsettled period in their lives. Providing appropriate learning programs for them, when each differs markedly from the next in regard to his or her stage of development, is challenging -- to say the least

Although there has been much discussion about the ideal schooling experience for early adolescents, Eichhorn (1980) notes that, "there is no universally accepted prototype for an educational program for the transition school" (p. 68). Further, there is little empirical data from which to draw conclusions about what teaching and learning are like in a transition school and what features of classroom instruction facilitate students' successful transition from elementary to junior high/middle school. An accumulation of basic descriptions about teaching and learning in a variety of junior high/middle schools does not exist. Currently, only two studies are available, in addition to the one reported here, that give extensive information about what happens in junior high/middle school classes. These are the study of junior high schools conducted at the Research and Development Center at the University of Texas at Austin (see, for example, Evertson, Anderson, Anderson & Brophy, 1980; Evertson, Sanford & Emmer, 1981; Sanford & Evertson, 1981), which furnishes basic descriptive information about the normative instructional practices of English and mathematics teachers in a large urban school district, and the study conducted by the National Middle School Association (see Lounsbury, Marani & Compton, 1980), which supplies descriptions of seventh-grade student life in middle schools.

The major purposes of the Junior High Transition Study are (1) to provide information about teaching and learning in the junior high/middle school, with special emphasis on the transition process, and (2) to make recommendations regarding teaching practices that help students move successfully from elementary to secondary school. The study was conducted in a single junior high school and the elementary schools from which the students came. It focuses on five areas of inquiry. They are:

1. Does the organization of instruction change from elementary school to junior high school? If so, how? What are the implications for students?

2. What are students' concerns and feelings about their elementary school experience? their junior high school experience? What are the implications for design of the transition process? for teaching practices?

3. How do students participate in, and respond to, junior high school instruction? Do students respond differently in different circumstances? Are these differences, if any, related to the success of students' transition to junior high school?

4. How do students describe and define various aspects of the junior high school experience? What are the implications, if any, for improvement of the schooling process in the junior high school?

5. What are parents' concerns, if any, about students' entrance to, and experience in, junior high school?

This volume reports the findings related to student participation in, and response to, junior high school instruction. Data related to the other areas of interest are contained in separate volumes.

The data base for this report includes case descriptions of 24 target students who were followed from their sixth-grade classes in elementary school to their seventh-grade classes in junior high school. Data were collected during the first five weeks of junior high school and again in November, at the time report cards were distributed for the first quarter of the school year.

This chapter presents a summary of the theoretical framework that underlies the analysis and reporting of the student data. It also provides a brief description of the junior high school that the students attended. Chapter Two reports the findings from the cross-student analyses. Chapter Three presents a brief description of the student sample and the data collection and analysis methods that were employed in the study. (A more complete description is presented in Volume I of the study report.) Each target student's case description is contained in Part B of the volume, which is published as a separate document.

Theoretical Framework Upon Which Student Transition Analysis Is Based

Two theoretical perspectives underscore the analysis and reporting of the transition study data regarding students' participation in and response to junior high school instruction. The first perspective inquires into the ways students participate in the person-to-person interactions and the learning tasks that are a regular part of classroom life. This perpsective builds on the notion that student participation will differ across students and across classes and thus may be influenced by the type of instructional situation(s) in which the students are placed. The second perspective grapples with the types of behaviors and concerns that must be considered in order to determine whether a student has made a successful transiion to junior high/middle school. It centers around the tenet that, while academic achievement is an important aspect of a student's successful performance in junior high/middle school, other factors, such as peer relations and adaptation to classroom and school rules and norms, also are worthy of notice. A more detailed discussion of these two perspectives follows.

Student Participation

The vast majority of instructional (classroom) settings demand that students communicate with one another, with the teacher, and with others, in order to obtain instruction, receive feedback, and let others know what they have learned. Further, to complete assigned tasks, students must participate in a variety of one-to-one, small-group and large-group settings. These settings most often require students to process and respond to social as well as cognitive information, if they are to participate successfully in the discussions and recitations that take place. Thus each student must be an active participant in the teaching and learning process. (S)he must respond to the teacher's questions, get the teacher's attention and help, and engage in dialogue with others.

Looking at classroom teaching and learning from such a student participation perspective is a recent focus of educational research. Several educational psychologists have become interested in the ways in which students influence the teacher-learning process. For example, in the Beginning Teacher Evaluation Study (Fisher, et al., 1978), student engagement in instructional tasks was included as a component of academic learning time. Doyle (1979 & 1980) explored the ways in which students mediated teaching effectiveness. Good and Power (1976) investigated the types of classroom environments in which different types of students functioned most successfully. Anderson and Scott (1978) reported on the relationship among teaching methods, student characteristics, and student involvement in learning. In addition, sociolinguists (e.g., Mehan 1979a, 1979b; Philips, 1972) are

interested in the ways in which verbal, nonverbal, and contextual clues signal appropriate student behavior in the classroom. Sociologists (e.g., Barr & Dreeben, 1977; Bossert, 1979) are interested in the ways in which classroom structures and social rules and norms establish expectations for and influence student behavior.

From among these various studies, the work of five researchers, or research teams, is of particular relevance to the study of student participation reported here. These are Good and Power's investigation of different types of students, Mehan's work on students interaction with others in the classroom, Philip's study of the ways Native American students participated in various types of classroom activities, Bossert's study of student interactions in different types of class activity structures, and Ward and Tikunoff's work on student participation categories. A discussion follows of each of these areas of inquiry.

Different types of students. Power (1974) observed 150 Grade 8 science students in four classes in two high schools in Brisbane, Australia. A battery of tests measuring 23 pupil cognitive, instructional, and personality characteristics was administered at the beginning of the school year. Near the end of the year, a second battery of tests was administered measuring ten outcome variables. Classroom interactions also were observed throughout the year. Hence this effort included data regarding actual student participation in classroom activities as well as information regarding other student characteristics and outcome variables. As part of the inquiry, Power explored how the antecedent pupil variables related to individual communication patterns in the classroom, and how these in turn related to achievement, attitudinal, and sociometric outcomes. Outcomes were found to covary with communication patterns established by individual students and the antecedent pupil variables in four independent ways. Based on these data, Power suggested that a typical classroom might include four types of students. These are discussed in the Power report and an article by Good and Power (1976). They encompass:

1. Success students. These students are essentially task-oriented and academically successful. They are cooperative in class, tackle almost all questions, and create no discipline problems. The teacher is more likely to direct difficult questions to them, most of which are answered correctly. Success students like school and tend to be liked by both teacher and peers.

2. Social students. These students are more person- than task-oriented. They have the ability to achieve, but value friendship more than schoolwork. They are likely to be called on fairly often by the teacher to help them become involved in the learning task rather than social interaction, and because they usually are able to answer easy questions, which,

in turn, helps the teacher maintain the flow of a discussion or recitation. However, some of their answers may be incorrect or irrelevant, particularly to complex questions. Also, social students are among those most likely to be criticized by the teacher. While they are fairly popular and have many friends, some social students are not well-liked by their teachers.

3. Dependent students. These students are the clinging vines of the classroom; always looking for more direction and help. They are frequent hand-raisers. When called on by the teacher, they are likely to guess and make errors. They make extensive, generally task-appropriate demands on the teacher. They require frequent teacher feedback and assistance in order to complete assigned tasks successfully. Teachers generally express concern regarding dependent pupils, while their peers reject them.

4. Alienated students. These students include the disadvantaged and the reluctant learners. In the extreme, they reject the school and everything it stands for. This rejection may take one of two forms: open hostility or total withdrawal. It follows that they are either highly aggressive and create serious behavior problems, or withdraw to the fringes of the classroom and are ignored by the teacher and other students. Teacher attitudes toward them range between rejection and indifference.

The above four student types were identified in the original Power study. In addition, based on further inquiry and analysis, Good and Power suggest a fifth type in their 1976 article. This is:

5. Phantom students. In most instances these students are neither noticed nor heard in the classroom. They are about average on everything but outward involvement in public settings. Some of them are shy, mousy students while others are quiet, independent workers of average ability. They rarely are actively involved in class group activities, never volunteer, and never create problems. The teacher has trouble remembering who they are and expresses attitudes of indifference toward them as do their peers.

Good and Power suggest that there may be considerable variation in teacher interaction with the different types of students. They point out that the learning environment that a particular teacher constructs may be more helpful for some students than for others. They indicate that devising a teaching and learning system

that maximizes the achievement of the diverse types of students who may be assigned to a given class is a complex process. They propose that teachers who are willing to vary their instructional setting can probably achieve a better balance in the match of instructional approach and the various student typologies than those who use but one. In turn, they suggest that all students in such classes should achieve more. They note that:

> If it is true that different [instructional] environments have different effects upon the same student or that the same environment has different effects on different students, then we need to know much more about the "effects" that are possible in classrooms and how to measure them. (p. 59)

Hence consideration of the types of students involved in the transition to junior high/middle school appears to be an essential component for understanding the classroom factors that support successful transition.

Student classroom communication. Several sociolinguistic studies of student participation stress the importance to student success in school of the communication that is required in the classroom. In these studies, production of socially appropriate speech is seen as an essential feature of effective communication. Use of language in the classroom is deemed to encompass both the formal aspects of language; and, more importantly, the functional aspects (see especially Shuy & Griffin, 1978). As defined by Mehan (1979a):

> The functional aspects of language concern effective language in different social situations. It includes the speaker-hearer's ability to communicate ideas and interpret intentions, knowledge of the functions that language can serve, knowledge of the strategies of language that can be used to carry out each function, and knowledge of the constraints that social situations impose on repertoire selection. (p. 2)

Some studies (e.g., Sanches & Blount, 1975; Gumperz & Hymes, 1974; Bauman & Sherzer, 1974) have described people's ways of speaking in different social situations in contrasting cultural contexts. Other studies have investigated what teachers and students need to know in order to operate effectively in classroom contexts. It is this latter group of studies that are of interest in the research reported here; in particular, the work of Mehan (1979a, 1979b).

Mehan (1979a) notes that research on the social organization of classroom instruction has shown that:

> . . . competent participation in the classroom community involves matters of interactional form as well as academic content. In addition to accumulating a stock of academic knowledge, students must learn that there are appropriate ways to cast their academic knowledge. Learning that certain ways of talking and acting are appropriate on some occasions and not others, learning when, and where, and with whom certain kinds of behavior can occur are some of the essential constituents of the stock of social knowledge relevant for effective participation in the classroom community. (p. 4)

Mehan found that classroom lessons were arranged in phases, each of which was characterized by distinctive interactions between participants. These were "opening," "instructional," and "closing" phases (Mehan, 1979b, p. 49). Florio (1978) identified similar lesson parts, which she termed "getting ready," "focused time," and "wind up." These phases of classroom activity have practical consequences for students, inasmuch as:

> Students' actions in the classroom are not only evaluated in terms of academic criteria (i.e., correctness), they are simultaneously evaluated in terms of social criteria (i.e., appropriateness). (Mehan, 1979a, p. 19)

Thus production of proper replies to teacher-initiated actions and generation of effective skills relative to appropriate ways of initiating and carrying out interactions with the teacher and other students are viewed by sociolinguists as essential components of competent student participation in a classroom. In addition, ability to identify the participation requirements of different contexts is considered to be an important skill (e.g., see Erickson & Shultz, 1977; McDermott & Godspodinoff. 1979). In this regard, from the sociolinguistic perspective, contexts are not equated with physical settings, but are described as situations constructed by people. What people are doing, and when and where they are doing it, create social contexts (Mehan, 1980; McDermott & Roth, 1978). Demands for behavior vary with the context in which an individual must function.

Investigation of students' transitions to junior high/middle school from such a sociolinguistic perspective has promise for providing new insights into, and/or explanations of, students' successes or difficulties in carrying out instructional (work) activities at the secondary level. Inasmuch as the junior high/middle school setting may require students to recognize and respond appropriately in a variety of contexts (as defined by sociolinguists), the extent to which students have mastered the necessary communication skills may mediate the success of their participation in both the academic and the social aspects of the school program.

Student response to classroom participation requirements. Philips (1972) studied the participation of Native American children in classrooms on the Warm Springs Reservation in central Oregon. In the introduction to the study report, Philips notes that:

> In class, speaking is the first and primary mode for communication of competence in all of the areas of skill and knowledge that schools propose to teach. Children communicate what they have learned to the teacher and their fellow students through speaking; only rarely do they demonstrate what they know through physical activity or creation of materials. While writing eventually becomes a second important channel or mode for communicating knowledge or demonstrating skills, writing, as a skill, is to a great extent developed through verbal interaction between student and teacher, as is reading. (p. 372)

Philips found that teachers, most often, interact with students in four ways. First, the teacher interacts with all of the students, either by addressing them as a group or addressing a single student in the presence of the rest of the students. Second, the teacher interacts with only some students in the class at one time, as in reading groups. Third, all students work independently at their desks, but with the teacher explicitly available for student-initiated verbal interaction, either by the student indicating he wants to communicate with the teacher by raising his or her hand, or by approaching the teacher at her desk. Fourth, students are divided into small, autonomous groups that they manage themselves, though always with more distant supervision by the teacher and usually to carry out a group project. (It should be noted that this latter type of interaction occurred infrequently during Philips's observations.)

Philips found that children's participation in the four "participation structures," as she called them, differed markedly. The Warm Springs Indian children were most involved in what they were doing when they were in the fourth structure, concentrating completely on their work until it was finished. They showed considerable reluctance to participate in the first two structures, frequently refusing or failing to utter a word. The consequences of this failure to participate were considered to be major, because when the students refused to speak, the teacher lost his or her primary avenue for determining what the students were learning and for teaching them the skills they needed.

Given that the Native American children studied by Philips responded so differently to different requirements for interacting with the teacher and others, investigation of the ways various types of students in transition from elementary school to junior high/middle school participate in similar varieties of classroom activities appears to be worth pursuing. In particular, if one or

more structures promote more productive involvement by a higher proportion of the students than others, this information would be useful to teachers who are trying to utilize maximally effective instructional strategies at the secondary level.

Student participation in various activity structures. The work of Bossert (1978) provides information regarding the ways in which various classroom organizational structures appear to encourage different forms of participation on the part of students. He argues that:

> . . . the structure and methods used to transmit the content of the curriculum and to facilitate development of required skills . . . are important determinants of learning. (p. 13)

Bossert goes on to indicate that five aspects of classroom instructional activities help delineate the structure in which students must work and influence the ways in which students must participate in order to be successful. These include, first, the modes of behavior that constitute the activity; in other words, what the teacher does, what the students are expected to do, and the number of different tasks underway at a given point in time. Second, the reward structure embodied in the activity is important. The ways in which students learn of their success or failure and whether the information is communicated publicly or privately establish distinctive participation requirements. Third, the sequencing of rewards and punishments in relation to behavior helps identify the appropriateness of various forms of participation. Fourth, the collective character of the activity establishes varying interactional demands. The number of people involved, whether tasks are divided among people or carried out independently, and the types of choices given to the participants all result in differing participation configurations and standards. Finally, the nature of social relations in the activity -- the amount of talking and mobility allowed -- creates the opportunity and demand for individuals to interact. This, in turn, further shapes the ways students must behave to be successful participants in an instructional activity.

Applying these criteria, Bossert identified three types of activity structures. These are recitation, class task, and multitask structures. In recitation, questions are directed by the teacher, and students sit listening, raise their hands when they want to be called on, and give answers to the questions publicly. Because a student's answer is public, everyone in the class knows when the question is answered correctly or incorrectly, regardless of whether a teacher uses a formal system of rewarding correct answers. Repeated success with correct responses, or repeated failure with incorrect responses, and the reaction both of the teacher and other classmates to this performance, will determine to a great degree the responsiveness of a student to an activity. Inasmuch as recitation is, by and large, a whole-class activity, and students are expected to speak only when called on, this structure

also requires students to determine acceptable ways to "get a turn". Both Mehan (1979a) and Florio (1978) point out the difficulty some students have developing this particular social interaction skill. Finally, there is little opportunity for interaction among students during a recitation so students are less apt to help one another gain access to the communication process than might be the case in a more informal setting. Since repetition of similar recitations for a given subject reveals who knows the answers and who does not, comparison of performances over time can affect subsequent social interaction in all types of classroom structures. Students who "know the answers" may refuse to interact with those who do not.

Class tasks include assignments to the entire class, which are expected to be accomplished at students' seats independently (although some teachers may allow students to work together on the assigned task). Performance is less public and, depending on how the teacher monitors students' work, a student's achievement ratings are likely to remain private. If students are asked to work independently while completing class tasks, there is little opportunity for social interaction; if they are allowed to work in groups, social relations are apt to result.

A multitask activity structure differs from a class task structure primarily in the degree of freedom of choice allowed to students. Thus, in a multitask structure, the students are provided, simultaneously, a variety of possible activities, and sometimes have the option of choice of which activity to complete at a given point in time. They also might choose to work independently or with others. Their performance is made public only to the degree that they choose to make it so. Interactions among students may or may not take place, depending on the students' desire to work with others. Since the teacher must devise a system for assessing and monitoring student progress on a variety of tasks, the system generally involves one-to-one teacher and student interaction and, thus, may involve a different set of communication skills on the part of the student than are demanded by the other two structures.

Bossert found that the activity structure of the classroom influenced the allocation of teacher assistance to individual students. Further, in recitation-dominated classrooms, an academic hierarchy was formed, based on performance, with an elite of top-performing students developing. Peer groups in these classrooms became academically homogeneous, paralleling the academic elites. Peer interactions and assistance of one another in the classroom centered within these academic groups. In contrast, in multitask structures, achievement levels did not affect friendship group choices. Students worked together regardless of academic level. Thus the occurrence of certain student participation characteristics, such as helping other students, being called on by the teacher, or making demands of the teacher, may be encouraged or discouraged, depending on the activity structure(s) in use in the classroom. As a result, as Philips found, some students may participate more successfully in one structure than another.

Student participation categories. Thus far, we have argued that students must participate competently in the learning tasks assigned to them in order to achieve the required skills and knowledge. Since classrooms typically include 30 or more individuals (students, a teacher, and possibly other adults), Ward, Tikunoff, Lash, Rounds, and Mergendoller (1981) are among researchers who contend that competent participation requires students to develop behaviors and understandings that not only facilitate completion of learning tasks, but also support interaction with the other members of the classroom group. This is particularly important because, as noted earlier, the ways in which students inform the teacher and others of their learning accomplishments and needs rely heavily upon verbal interactions. Building on the work cited above and extending this to asking how students actually behave when participating in instructional activities, Ward, et al., have identified six participation categories that describe the ways in which most students become involved in classroom activities.

The Ward, et al., categories originally were developed using a constant comparative analysis (after Glaser & Strauss, 1967) of the ways in which 35 fourth-grade students in nine classrooms participated in a mathematics unit on measurement. For this analysis the performance of each student was compared with that of every other student, using narrative descriptions of each student's engagement in instruction over some 15 days of class time. While the categories resemble, in several ways, those developed by Good and Power (see earlier discussion), it is important to note that they were derived through an entirely different analysis process and were formed independent of knowledge of the Good and Power work. Hence they not only provide in sight into the different ways students participate in instructional tasks, they also provide verification -- derived from observations of classrooms in the United States -- of the student types that emerged from the study of eighth-grade instruction in Australia.

The six participation categories that were identified by Ward, et al., include: (1) success/multitask, (2) social, (3) dependent, (4) phantom, (5) isolate, and (6) alienate. Each category incorporates participation characteristics (properties) that appear to be unique to that particular category. In the original Ward, et al., study, students who evidenced a particular configuration of participation characteristics (fit within a particular category), for the most part, did not manifest characteristics aligned with other categories. Table 1.1 displays the predominant characteristics that are descriptive of each participation category. The discussion that follows elaborates on these characteristics.

Success/multitask participation. The success/multitask participation category includes students whose participation is best described by four characteristics:

- almost always is involved in some form of work, carrying out several tasks concurrently, performing well on all of them;

Table 1.1

Student Participation Categories and Characteristics Within Categories

PARTICIPATION CHARACTERISTICS	PARTICIPATION CATEGORY					
	Success/Multitask	Social	Dependent	Phantom	Isolate	Alienate
	Almost always involved in some work-oriented activity, carrying out several activities concurrently, performing well on all of them.	Periods of concentration on assigned tasks are brief and mixed with high involvement in conversations with other students, only some of which are academically oriented.	When working in small groups with the teacher, is involved in learning activity.	Almost always attends to instructional tasks, but with little active verbal or physical involvement.	Sporadic engagement in assigned work; instead, gazes around room, quietly plays with pencils, etc., but does not disturb others.	Disrupts instructional activities.
	Answers teacher's questions when called on, giving correct and complete responses; seldom volunteers answers.	Volunteers answers to questions, actively participates in lessons; responses to difficult questions or tasks may not be correct.	Does not attend to instruction in large group; however, may remain on task if large group activity includes manipulative tasks.	Almost never initiates interaction with teacher, other students, or other adults in the classroom.		Confronts other students.
	Seldom interrupts work to talk with other students; may interact if contact is initiated by other students or assigned by teacher to work with a group.	Voluntarily serves as peer teacher; when doing so, often criticizes other students' work.	Needs frequent assistance and/or feedback from the teacher or others.	Almost never volunteers answers to teacher's questions.	Separated from others by physical location or interactive disassociation.	Seldom attends to assigned tasks.
	Seldom needs help from teacher, but initiates interaction when assistance is needed.	Interaction with others leads to sanctioning by teacher.	If assistance and/or feedback are not received, does not continue to be engaged in learning activity.	Seldom involved in teacher initiated interactions.	Hesitant to have others see or react to work.	Seldom responds to teacher's questions.
		Initiates interaction with the teacher to obtain assistance or feedback or for own social purposes.				Disruptive behavior leads to frequent sanctions by teacher.

- answers teacher's questions when called on, giving correct and complete responses; seldom volunteers or calls out answers;

- seldom interrupts work to talk with other students; however, may interact with them during work time if contact is initiated by the other students, or is assigned by the teacher to work with a group;

- seldom needs help from the teacher, but initiates interaction with the teacher when necessary to gain needed assistance or feedback.

A student whose participation characteristics fit within this category is work-oriented. Once a task is assigned, the student does it. Often the student is observed listening to the teacher explain the day's lesson and, at the same time, is described as completing the assigned worksheet. Some success/multitask students also read a book and engage in other activities while filling in worksheets and participating in class discussions. Nonetheless, they perform well on the worksheets and, when called on by the teacher, answer the questions correctly, even though they have been doing other tasks during the class recitation or discussion. These students seldom call out or volunteer answers to the teacher's questions. However, the teacher often asks them to respond to difficult questions other students cannot answer.

Success/multitask students prefer to work alone. They seldom initiate conversations with other students. When this does occur, it typically is after the students have completed the assigned work activities. When other students initiate interactions with them, the success/multitask students usually respond with brief, task-oriented statements. Success/multitask students generally complete assigned tasks with no help from the teacher. On those few occasions when assistance is needed, they actively seek the teacher's attention and assistance.

Social participation. The social participation category includes students whose participation characteristics center around interaction with others. These students contrast markedly with the success/multitask students. Rather than concentrating on the assigned task, they exhibit brief periods of on-task activity mixed with frequent conversations with other students. They like to work with other students, often voluntarily serving as peer teachers. They volunteer answers to the teacher's questions. In fact, they often appear to be more interested in answering, per se, than in giving correct answers. More specifically, the characteristics exhibited by a social student include:

- brief periods of concentration on assigned tasks are mixed with high involvement in conversations with others, only some of which are academically oriented;

- active involvement in lessons includes voluntary answers to teacher's questions, some of which may not be correct;
- voluntarily serves as a peer teacher; when doing so, often is critical of other students' work;
- interaction with others often leads to sanctioning by teacher;
- initiates interaction with the teacher to obtain assistance or feedback and for social purposes.

Dependent participation. As suggested by the label given to the category, students whose participation characteristics fit the dependent category require frequent attention, feedback, explanation, and/or other assistance by the teacher, other students, or other adults (such as a teacher aide) in order to stay on task. The kind of feedback, etc., that is needed varies across students. Some students need academic help. At most, they remember the directions for one step of an instructional task at a time and need to have additional steps re-explained if they are to proceed with the task successfully. They respond to a series of simple questions better than to a single complex question. They attend to the teacher's instruction when in a small group, where the teacher can monitor their progress at each step and provide immediate assistance and reinforcement. In total-class instructional settings, they are inattentive. Students with these participation characteristics are given the sublabel, dependent academic.

Other dependent students do not require the kinds of academic assistance outlined above. Rather, they are able to do assigned tasks successfully -- that is, they know and can perform the academic work on their own -- but will not proceed with the task unless given frequent reinforcement and approval by the teacher, their peers, or others. Some of these students frequently bring completed work to "show" the teacher and receive a "Good," "Okay," or "Keep going" response, or they show their work to their peers to obtain similar feedback. Others wait for the teacher or others to respond, doing no academic work in the meantime. If feedback is not received, these dependent students typically cease working on assigned tasks. Instead, they sit at their desks playing with various objects, look around the classroom, or wander around the classroom until reinforcement is given. Since total-class instruction does not provide opportunity for reinforcement of individual students as readily as small-group instruction, these students participate most successfully when working in a small group with the teacher. Students with these participation characteristics are given the sublabel, dependent verifier.

Four characteristics describe both academic dependent and dependent verifier participation. As noted above, the differentiation is in the kind of feedback and assistance that are required,

rather than in the ways these students behave in the classroom. The characteristics are:

- when working in a small group with the teacher, student is involved in the learning activity;
- typically does not attend to instruction that occurs in a large-group (e.g., total-class) situations; however, may remain on task if a large-group activity includes manipulative tasks that are simple and are reinforcing in and of themselves (e.g., completing the activity demonstrates to the student that it was done correctly, without feedback from the teacher);
- needs frequent feedback and/or assistance from the teacher and/or others;
- if feedback and/or assistance are not received, does not continue to be engaged in assigned learning activities.

Phantom participation. In contrast to the other participation categories, the characteristics that identify phantom participation, for the most part, build around behaviors and interactions that do not occur, rather than those that do. Students in this category seldom interact with others. In particular, they almost never initiate conversations with other students, ask the teacher for assistance or feedback, or volunteer answers to the teacher's questions. Although they appear to be involved in classroom activities -- e.g., they watch, they listen, they voice quiet responses to questions -- they do not participate in verbally or visibly obvious ways in either total-class or small-group instructional activities. These students create no problems for, and make no demands on, the teacher. In turn, the teacher seldom initiates interaction with these students for academic, reinforcement, behavior control, or social purposes.

In summary, phantom students are seldom seen or heard. The characteristics that best describe this participation category include:

- almost always attends to instructional activities and assigned tasks, but with little, if any, active verbal or physical involvement;
- almost never initiates interaction with teacher, students, or other adults in the classroom;
- almost never volunteers answers to teacher's questions;
- seldom is observably involved in teacher-initiated discussions, sanctions, etc.

Isolate participation. In several respects, the isolate participation category builds on characteristics that are similar to those of the phantom category. It, too, includes students who seldom interact with others. However, three important differences between the two categories have been identified. These unique characteristics serve as the basis for identifying a student as an isolate participant, rather than a phantom. They are:

- evidences sporadic engagement in assigned instructional activity, whether in large or small group; often gazes around the room, quietly plays with pencils and other objects; however, does not disturb teacher or other students;
- is separated from other students by physical location, e.g., student purposely seats self outside the group; or disassociation, e.g., other students refuse to talk with or assist this student;
- is hesitant to have others see or react to work.

Alienate participation. The alienate participation category stresses antischool, antilearning, and antisocial behavior. Students who exhibit these participation characteristics work against productive involvement in school. They often appear purposefully to create confrontations with other students and the teacher and blatantly to engage in off-task activities. Teachers identify them as discipline problems, voice considerable concern about their future success in school, and seek help in identifying techniques and strategies that might change their mode of participation.

The characteristics that specifically describe the alienate participation category include:

- frequently disrupts total class, small group, or individual instructional activities;
- confronts other students, often disrupting their work and contributing to their receiving sanctions from the teacher;
- seldom attends to assigned instructional tasks; off-task behavior is readily observable, typically unrelated to school tasks and often disruptive of work being done by others;
- seldom responds to teacher's questions even when called on directly;
- disruptive behavior leads to frequent sanctions by the teacher.

Several findings from the Ward, et al., work are particularly germane to the study of students' transition to junior high/middle school. First, the behavioral rules and norms in some classrooms make it difficult for students to participate appropriately and, at the sametime, exhibit certain participation characteristics. For example, some structures restrict social interactions; others provide little or no opportunity for students to seek or receive feedback and reinforcement; still others demand that students work together cooperatively in small groups. Yet, regardless of the classroom structures in which students were placed, Ward, et al., found that, over time, a given student's way of participating seemed to fit one category better than another and, across the entire group of students, all six participation categories were represented. Further, some students found it more difficult to participate appropriately in one type of structure than other students did.

These findings suggest that within the group of students entering a junior high/middle school, one may expect to find one or more students whose behavior generally can be described as fitting one of the above categories. This being the case, as Good and Power proposed, maximization of instruction may demand that a variety of student participation, as well as learning, needs be considered and accommodated, or that students be taught to decode, understand, and respond to classroom participation requirements in the same way they are taught content. Further, since junior high/middle school settings nearly always require students to work successfully in multiple classroom settings, the match between students' participation characteristics and classroom participation demands may increase several fold in complexity and importance at this level, compared with the elementary level. Hence attention to the participation requirements of instruction, students' ways of participating, and the outcomes that result appears to be pertinent to obtaining greater understanding of the school, classroom, and instructional features related to students' successful transition from elementary to secondary school.

Summary. Research suggests that student participation differs in various classroom instructional settings (structures), and that students differ from one another in terms of the manner in which they participate in the instructional tasks that occur. Hence the study of students' transitions to junior high school may be enhanced by inquiry into these features of classroom-based teaching and learning.

This line of inquiry has been pursued in two ways in the Junior High School Transition Study. First, target students were selected using the Ward, et al., participation categories. Second, target students' participation in various classroom structures was described and analyzed. Chapter Two herein describes the types of classroom structures in which the students were observed and summarizes the differences, if any in student participation that were identified in the various structures. Part B of this volume (published separately) contains more detailed information about both the structures and each student's participation.

Successful Transition

Building upon the above discussion of the importance of the social and communication, as well as the academic, aspects of classroom teaching and learning, it is clear that the criteria for successful transition to junior high school should incorporate more than academic achievement. The characteristics of early adolescents also argue for the importance of a broad array of success criteria. For example, Konopka (1973) suggests that adolescents need "to participate as responsible members of households, the workplace, and society; to gain experience in decision making; to interact with peers and acquire a sense of belonging; to discover self by looking outward and inward; to formulate their own value systems; to try out roles; to develop a sense of accountability among equals; to cultivate a capacity to enjoy life" (pp. 14-15). Lipsitz (1980) notes that early adolescents consciously explore their uniqueness as individuals and their relatedness to other human beings. In order to do this, she indicates that "adolescents depend upon others to reflect to them a positive, realistic image of self that can be integrated with a personal inner image" (p. 14). Eichhorn (1980) states that "peer relations are intense at this stage and peer influence is significant for socialization and certainly for educational processes" (p. 65). He goes on to point out that effective implementation of programs in a junior/high middle school requires successful interpersonal relationships.

In addition, recent research conducted at the seventh- and eighth-grade level has attended to a variety of student outcomes. For example, Fisher (1978) reports that junior high school teachers judged seventh- and eighth-grade male students' competence using five factors: (1) academic achievement and work habits; (2) intrusiveness in the classroom, e.g., openly clashing with others; (3) social avoidance; (4) dependency/immaturity; and (5) extreme behaviors, e.g., cheats, talks of self as ugly or stupid. Soar and Soar (1982) recently utilized student task involvement and student disorder as outcome measures in a study of junior high school classrooms. Other researchers (for instance, Epstein & Toepfer, 1978; Samples, 1976; Barnes, 1975) discuss the requirements of mental and physical growth and development during early adolescence and the student performance that might be expected, given that a student has reached one of several different stages of development.

Thus it appears that the success of students' transitions to junior high/middle school should be judged using at least four criteria. In no order of priority, these are:

- Academic achievement. Academic achievement may be measured using a student's performance on standardized achievement tests, or on criterion-referenced tests. Grades earned by a student also may be used, so long as the possible variations in the performance criteria imposed by various teachers in awarding a specific grade are kept in mind.

- Involvement in academic tasks. The amount of class time a student is engaged in academic vs. nonacademic tasks may serve as a short-term measure of performance. The completeness and correctness of the written work the student does and the appropriateness, completeness, and correctness of a student's oral responses (or lack of response) to the teacher's oral questions during recitation also may be considered.

- Response to rules and norms. In most junior high/middle school classrooms, norms and rules are established relative to interaction with others, movement about the classroom, initiation of contacts with the teacher, and so forth. Procedures for format and submission of work and work schedules also are set up. The extent to which a student's behavior suggests (s)he understands and is responding appropriately to these requirements in a particular class may serve as a measure of successful participation in that setting. The school also may impose rules and norms. A student's understanding of, and response to, these may be considered as well.

- Relationships with others. The above discussion points out the importance of interaction with others to the instructional process. The significance of peer and adult relations in the development of early adolescents also has been mentioned. The extent to which a student establishes relationships with others that, at a minimum, are not hostile provides a crude but interpretable measure of the student's accomplishments in this area.

In order to avoid the error of judging a student's transition from elementary to junior high/middle school to be successful when one or more important ingredients of successful participation in a junior high/middle school setting are out of synch, the study that is reported herein utilized the four success criteria out-lined above. In addition, the students' junior high/middle school experiences were described in terms of multiple dimensions of the instructional process (see earlier discussion regarding classroom interaction and structures) and multiple types of outcomes, in order to obtain information regarding the complexity of teaching and learning at this level of schooling. Using these data, the study attempts to identify the requirements for effective schooling for students ages 10-14.

The Junior High School in Which the Transition Study Was Conducted

While the transition study reported here emphasizes students' experiences in the classroom, the work of Metz (1978) underscores the importance of the school setting as well. For example, she states:

> The way that the staffs of the schools as wholes defined the character of the student body and the way they treated them in their interactions in the corridors, in assemblies, and in informal encounters had a considerable impact upon the students' attitude toward the school and their behavior both outside and inside the classroom. (p. 218)

Metz further notes that students inhabit not just classrooms, but corridors, cafeterias, and washrooms. To understand the effectiveness of various instructional processes, she suggests that the context of the school and school district must be specified. Thus, to aid in interpreting the findings from the transition study, the following description of Waverley Junior High School is provided.

Waverley Junior High School is one of two junior high schools serving a suburban-rural area with a total population of approximately 30,000 people. The school's service area is located at the outer edge of a large metropolitan region to which many of the residents commute for employment. Historically, the area has been agricultural, and the numerous feed mills and agricultural supply stores that continue to operate in the area testify that many citizens still derive their livelihood from this sector of the economy.

Located at the intersection of one of the major north-south freeways in the state, Waverley draws students from a demographic cross section of families ranging from upper-middle to lower-middle income. The other junior high in the school district, on the whole, serves a wealthier population.

The school facility is a rambling one-story complex composed of several structures. The architectural design produces crowd flow difficulties which, in turn, cause problems. The classrooms of the school are contained in three buildings, each comprising eight to ten classrooms, which exit onto covered walkways. The buildings are placed parallel to one another about 30 feet apart. They are bisected by a hallway. At the end of each period, in order to reach either their next class, their lockers, or both, most of the school's 700 or so students must funnel through this hall, which is no more than 20 feet wide. To compound the problem, the lockers are stacked in two levels, an upper and a lower, along the sides of the hall. Students who have the upper lockers (usually

eighth-graders) unintentionally -- or intentionally -- drop possessions on those with the lower lockers (usually seventh-graders). Further, as there are not enough lockers for all the students, some students have to share a single locker. Thus, even under the best of circumstances, the situation in this hall is impossible. At any given break between classes, the students' attempts to reach their lockers and their rapid movement across, up, and down the hall to get to the next classroom, inevitably lead to bumping and jostling. Students, teachers, and administrators all report that this hallway is the locus of many fights and much bullying. Hence the architectural design of the school has compounded a problem present at most, if not all, junior high schools -- discipline.

On the whole, at the time of the Transition Study, the teachers and administrators at Waverley seemed to focus much of their energy toward disciplinary concerns and actions. The administrators often voiced concern to the researchers over fights, robberies, and molestations that occurred during or after school. The principal and the teachers discussed the school's reputation as a "tough" or "bad" school, a school with a "drug-tough aura." It must be noted that the case descriptions in this volume provide only minimal support for these concerns. While several target students discussed the impact of theft and violence on their transition, these incidents were fewer than might have been expected, based on the concern expressed by the school staff and by parents. Nonetheless, during a round table held on a September evening for seventh-grade parents, the researchers listened as school administrators and the parents carried on a frank, though never acrimonious, discussion of school problems. Drugs, teenage pregnancy, and school-wide discipline problems were the major topics of conversation. Altercations that occurred on the freeway overpass as the students went to from school were a major worry for the parents. Few classroom issues were raised and these were all discipline-related.

While emphasizing discipline, at the time of the study the school appeared to have gaps in the academic program. For example, there was no seventh-grade science program. Seventh-grade math seemed targeted for average and below average students and included considerable overlap with fifth- and sixth-grade math content, at least through the first quarter of the school year. Neither the individual teachers we observed nor the school made provision for students who already had mastered the seventh-grade syllabus. There was no school-wide program for academically gifted students, even though state funding was available for such a program. If one of the purposes of a junior high school is to provide a thorough, systematic grounding in the academic disciplines, the program at Waverley seemed to be designed around the needs of the "average" student.

Further insights into the attitudes toward learning that pervaded the school were obtained during a preschool orientation meeting for seventh-graders and their parents. The principal, the

counselor, and the vice principal each spoke to the entering students, explaining procedures and school rules. Speaking of the enterprise of learning, the principal said, "Learning is not fun, but we do our best to make it enjoyable." The principal's comments were followed by a few welcoming remarks by the head cheerleader and a rally led by the cheerleading squad -- all girls. The purpose of this rally was evidently to inoculcate school spirit among the neophytes. As the principal said in an earlier interview:

> It's always been my impression, having worked in schools and watched schools, that your real esprit comes from your PE program, from a good PE program.

This may explain why the administration chose the cheerleaders to welcome the new students, rather than, say, the student government officers, members of the honor society, or the student chorus and band. In any event, whether inadvertently or not, the opening program established the cheerleaders and the members of the athletic teams for whom they "cheered" as the new students' models toward which to strive. Academic success was not emphasized or recognized during the orientation meeting.

Within this setting, seventh- and eighth-grade classes were conducted at Waverley Junior High School

Conclusion

This chapter has presented the general framework that drove the study of students' transition to junior high school. It also has described the junior high school the students entered. The next chapter summarizes the findings regarding the types of instructional settings in which the students were required to participate in Waverley Junior High School and the ways in which they went about learning in these settings. Chapter Three discusses how successfully the 24 target students made the transition to junior high school given these various participation requirements. The final chapter provides information regarding the sample and methodology employed to obtain the data reported in Chapters Two and Three.

CHAPTER TWO

FINDINGS REGARDING TARGET STUDENTS' PARTICIPATION IN JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL CLASSES

This chapter presents the findings regarding 24 target students' participation in the junior high school classes in which they were observed. The target students were selected from among the sixth-grade students in four elementary schools that fed into Waverely Junior High School. The data reported in this chapter are taken from individual case descriptions that were developed for each target student. The discussion looks at the transition from the standpoint of the manner in which the students participated in classroom instructional activities in sixth grade, their participation in each of the seventh-grade classes in which they were observed, and the characteristics of the instructional process in these seventh-grade classrooms. It first describes briefly the target student sample and the data sources used in preparing the case descriptions (these are described in more detail in Chapter Three). Then, the findings regarding organization of instruction in the seventh-grade classes are summarized. (Complete information about classroom organization is presented in Volume II of the study report.) This is followed by presentation of the data regarding various students' participation.

Target Student Data Base

As noted, 24 target students were studied in-depth during the first five weeks of their seventh-grade school year. Additional information regarding these students' transition experiences also was collected in November at the time that the grades for the fall quarter were distributed. In addition, interviews were conducted with the students in the spring of the seventh grade and they completed the Student Opinion Survey along with the other seventh-grade students at that time.

The data reported in this volume concentrate on the first five weeks of the school year and the week in November when grades were received. The spring data are reported in other volumes of the report (see Volume III and Volume V).

The target students were selected so the sample included (a) students from each of the 4 elementary schools where sixth-grade classroom observations were conducted, (b) 12 boys and 12 girls,

and (c) students with varying classroom participation characteristics. The final sample, in addition to 12 boys and 12 girls, included 5 students from CH Dana Elementary School, 5 from Bluff Street Elementary School, 6 from Hawthorne Elementary School, and 8 from JM Keynes Elementary School.

In terms of classroom participation, the categories identified by Ward, et al., (see discussion in Chapter One) were utilized to select the students. The sixth-grade teachers rated each student in their respective classes based on these categories. Using these ratings, 4 students were selected who had been rated as alienates by their teacher(s). Similarly, 4 students with phantom ratings, 4 with social ratings, and 4 with success/multitask ratings were selected. Eight students with dependent ratings were included because previous research suggested that these students might find it particularly difficult to adapt to a new school situation.

Multiple types of data were obtained and utilized in preparing the case descriptions. These include classroom observation narratives, informal observation comments regarding target students, open-ended interviews with the target students, open-ended interviews with the target students' parents, teacher comments regarding the target students who were in their classes, and the target students' responses to the Student Opinion Survey at the end of grade six.

The classroom observations focused on the target students as they interacted with the teacher and/or other students. The observer rotated among the target students in a classroom in five minute cycles. Generally, a particular target student was observed for three or more cycles during each observation period. Depending upon the number of classes in which a target student was observed, the number of observation periods for a given target student might range from a minimum of 14 to a maximum of 46. A narrative description of the target student's interaction with the teacher and other students was prepared at the end of each observation period. Typed manuscripts of the narratives were prepared and served as a primary source of information regarding the student's participation in his or her classes.

In addition to the formal observations, each observer also prepared an informal discussion of each target student whom (s)he observed. This statement included the observer's impressions of the student and his or her success in making the transition to junior high school. Events that occurred during the observation period that the observer thought would help interpret the student's behavior in a particular classroom also were described. Each observer was required to prepare at least one informal observation statement for each target student (s)he observed. This was prepared in November at the end of the entire classroom observation cycle. However, for most students informal statements were prepared throughout the study. Frequent informal comments were provided regarding students who had an unusually large number of

transition problems or who encountered situations that were particularly interesting.

The open-ended interviews with the target students were conducted in mid-October and again in mid-November of the seventh-grade year. During these interviews, the students were asked to describe their transition experiences to date and to talk about whether their transitions were successful, and why. Thus, these interviews provided an opportunity to look at the transition process from an inside as well as an outside perspective.

The open-ended interviews with the target students' parents were conducted in August, before seventh grade began, and in November, after the first quarter grades had been distributed. These interviews sought information about the students' transitions from yet another perspective and afforded an opportunity to identify the criteria the parents were using to assess the success of their particular child's move to junior high school

At the end of the fall data collection, the target students were identified to the seventh-grade teachers. Each teacher was asked to dictate on an audiotape informal comments about how successful each target student who was in his or her class had been in making the transition to junior high school. At this time, each teacher also rated the target students' participation characteristics (again using the categories and characteristics developed by Ward, et al.).

The target students' opinions about their schooling experiences served as another data source. The cooperating school district administered a Student Opinion Survey to all students in the spring of the sixth-grade year and again in the spring of seventh-grade. As noted above, only the sixth-grade data were used in preparing the target student case descriptions.

Information also was obtained regarding the target students' first quarter grade in each of the seventh-grade classes in which (s)he was observed.

Hence, the target student case descriptions were created from a "thick" data base that tapped the students' transition experiences from multiple perspectives. The findings that are reported thus offer a multi-faceted view of the instructional and social aspects of the schooling experience that facilitated or hindered students' success in transition to junior high school.

Organization of Instruction in Grade Seven

Information regarding the ways in which instruction was organized in the seventh-grade classes in which the target students were observed was obtained through analysis of the activity structure coding completed as part of the classroom observation procedure

and by extracting relevant information from the narrative descriptions of the teacher's interaction with the target students. These data are reported in detail in Volume II of this report. A summary is provided here in order to aid in interpreting any differences in target student participation that may be identified across the various classes.

Inquiry into the activity structure(s) in use in a classroom requires information regarding six aspects of the instructional process. One is the content of instruction with attention given to the cognitive complexity of the assigned learning tasks as well as the skills and knowledge that are to be acquired. The number, size, and composition of the group(s) used for instruction comprises a second element of the activity structure. This may range from whole group instruction -- e. g., one group comprised of the entire class of 30 or so students -- to several groups made up of students assigned heterogeneously, based on ability, and so forth. The third activity structure element is division of labor. This element is concerned with the extent to which all students complete all parts of the same task or the teacher assigns parts of a task to different students and then has them combine their respective products to form a single final product. The aspects of the instructional activity over which the student has some control represent a fourth activity structure element. Here the options may range from no student control, all activities are assigned by the teacher, to a situation in which the student proposes what (s)he will study, how the learning outcomes will be reported to the teacher, and/or how the new skills and knowledge the student has acquired will be tested. A fifth element is the types of evaluation that occur as part of the instructional process. Whether the teacher's evaluation stresses academic or behavior control matters is important. The degree to which the evaluation is observable by others or is conducted privately is described. Finally, the ways in which students advance from one learning activity to another are studied. The extent to which the student is free to move ahead on his or her own or is dependent on the teacher to provide the next learning task is of particular interest.

Data that were obtained regarding organization of instruction at the seventh-grade level indicate that the activity structures in the seventh-grade classrooms were neither diverse nor complex. A student might go for several days experiencing only whole-group instruction. There was little division of labor observed in any class. For the most part, student control was restricted to control over pacing, a necessary result of assignments that lasted longer than one day. Student control over the content of an assigned activity was evident in only two classes, and, in these cases, the items over which students had control -- the number of vocabulary words to learn and whether to do extra credit work -- seemed uncomplicated. Two teachers allowed the students to choose the amount of work they would do from a list of learning activities selected and assigned by the teacher. This, in turn, was linked to the grade they would earn for a particular unit or assignment. Evaluation of academic progress typically was private. Behavior

was evaluated publically in all the classes. Student advancement to new content was dependent on the teacher deciding that the whole group, or less frequently a small group, was ready to move ahead.

Further, the content of instruction in seventh grade, for the most part, emphasized fact-recall and fill-in-the-blank exercises. Only the high ability groups in the English classes were required to complete more complex learning tasks. Even in those classes where the teachers established varying performance criteria in order for students to earn higher grades, the higher grade requirements generally asked the students to do more of the same type of lower cognitive activities rather than different, more complex ones.

However, although the seventh-grade findings underlined the similarity of the activity structures across the classes at Waverley, teacher behavior within the structures differed. Thus, in discussing the target students' participation in the various classes in which they were observed, possible explanations for differences in students' behavior are more apt to be related to the teacher's use of these behaviors than to the activity structure that was established in the classroom. The four behaviors that differentiated among the teachers were:

- The extent to which the teacher was accessible to the students to help them with assigned tasks and provide feedback and reinforcement.
- The degree to which the teacher established and maintained classroom rules and norms and focused disciplinary actions on the individual(s) who did not conform to these expectations, rather than using large group sanctions.
- The extent to which the teacher stressed only content coverage or attended to students' interest in the assigned tasks as well as the content to be taught.
- The clarity of the teacher's directions and explanations, including the extent to which the teacher specified the requirements and characteristics of high quality vs. adequate student performance.

Table 2.1 provides information regarding the presence of these instructional features in the seventh-grade classes that were observed.

Relative to teacher accessibility, Teachers AA, AB, AE, AF, AG, and AJ generally were available to help their students. While the style of interaction differed, students in these classes could obtain help when they needed it by raising their hands or going to the teacher to ask questions. In some classes, the teacher moved about the room on a regular basis, checking in with each student

to be sure (s)he knew what to do and was on-task and proceeding correctly. In others, the responsibility for initiating contact with the teacher was placed on the students. When this contact was made, the teacher would respond.

Three teachers were not accessible to their students. The student interview data included numerous comments regarding Teacher AD's failure to help students. The observation data indicated that Teacher AH was also inaccessible. His habit of wearing dark glasses seemed to emphasize his remoteness from the students. Teacher AI likewise was observed ignoring students' requests for help.

The observation narratives for Teacher AC and Teacher AK, as well as the interviews with the target students in their classes, make no reference to accessibility. Hence, no conclusions can be reached relative to the occurrence of this teacher behavior in these classes.

Teachers' success in obtaining students' conformance to classroom rules and norms was stressed by students in their interviews. In addition, the observation narratives included numerous examples of behavior control by the teachers. Based on the observation narratives, the extent to which the teacher made the rules and norms clear to the students seemed to be important. Likewise, sanctioning of only the student (or students) who failed to follow one or more rules or norms was more successful than group discipline. Further, the students differentiated among teachers whose rules and norms were "flexible," that is, were based on criteria such as not disturbing others while they worked or listening when instructions were being given, and those who established rigid rule systems that allowed students little opportunity to determine whether a particular level of interaction or mobility was appropriate based on concern for others and the types of activities that were underway in the classroom.

As noted in Table 2.1, Teachers AA, AC, AF, AH, and AK established flexible rules and norms systems. Teachers AB, AG, AI, and AJ established rules and norms that were rigidly enforced. Students had few opportunities to function in varying ways depending upon the situation in their classes. Teacher AE seemed to differ from both these groups of teachers. It was not clear whether she established and expected students to conform to a set of rules and norms or used an open-ended approach to classroom behavior. Although she was observed sanctioning students for failing to follow a specific rule, the students perceived her to be a teacher who gave warnings but not punishments. Teacher AD is the only teacher who was observed to have little, or no, control over student behavior in the classroom.

The majority of the seventh-grade teachers approached teaching from what might be termed a "content orientation." Coverage of curriculum content was of major concern. They defined the academic work based on the material to be taught. However, within

Table 2.1

Presence of Instructional Features
That Differentiated Among Students'
Learning Experiences in Seventh-Grade Classes

Seventh-Grade Teacher and Subject(s) Taught	Within-Activity-Structure Features			
	Teacher Accessibility	Establishment and Enforcement of Rules and Norms	Concerned With Students' Interest	Clear Explanations and Directions
AA (English)	Yes	Yes, flexible	Yes	Yes
AB (English and History)	Yes	Yes, rigid	Somewhat	No
AC (English)	Not mentioned	Yes, flexible	Yes	Not mentioned
AD (Math)	No	No	No	No
AE (Math)	Yes	Not clear	Yes	Not mentioned
AF (Art)	Yes	Yes, flexible	Yes	Not mentioned
AG (History and Music)	Yes	Yes, rigid	Not mentioned	Yes
AH (Reading)	No	Yes, flexible	No	Yes
AI (Reading)	No	Yes, rigid	No	Not mentioned
AJ (History and Math)	Yes	Yes, rigid	Yes	Not mentioned
AK (Home Economics)	Not mentioned	Yes, flexible	Yes	Not mentioned

this general framework, some teachers also were concerned about maintaining the students' interest in the content. These teachers used a variety of strategies to build students' interests. Teacher AA used humor and drama. Teacher AC alternated the day of the week on which students did a certain task. Teacher AE attempted to tie the math curriculum to the students' current and future lives. Given the repetitiveness of the content in math (seventh-grade math, at least for the fall term, repeated concepts and skills most of the students had mastered in grades five or six), Teacher AE worked against difficult odds to do this. Teacher AF's art class differed from the other classes in the lack of emphasis on reading, writing, and discussion. Hense, this class offered students a break in the lecture/discussion/seatwork day. Teacher AJ explained why the study of history was important and utilized a flexible grading system that seemed to challenge the better students and keep them engaged in academic tasks. The cooking part of Teacher AK's home economic classes also stimulated students' interest; the nutrition activities did not. The other teachers were less concerned with students' interest.

The fourth instructional feature that differentiated among students' classroom experiences was the clarity of the teacher's explanations and directions. Data regarding this feature were included in less than half the teacher observation narratives. Positive statements regarding clarity were included in the narratives of Teachers AA, AG, and AH. Negative statements were reported in the descriptions of Teachers AB and AD. No mention was made of this aspect of the other classes.

Based on the information summarized above and presented in detail in Volume II, it appears that the presence of these four instructional features in a class provided students with a learning experience that differed markedly from that which occurred in classes where one or more of the features was missing. Hence inquiry into the target students' participation in the various classes in which they were observed is warranted.

Student Participation Characteristics

In Chapter One, literature was reviewed regarding the ways in which students participate in classroom instructional activities and the importance of appropriate participation to students' success in learning. The discussion also outlined six patterns of participation that students have been observed to exhibit. In addition, investigation of the changes, if any, that occur in students' participation in seventh grade compared with sixth grade was pointed out as an area of interest. Differences, if any, in participation across the various seventh-grade classes in which the students were observed also was suggested as a source of useful information regarding the requirements for successful student performance at the junior high/middle school level. The findings that follow focus on these two topics. The target student case

descriptions serve as the primary data source for the analysis. Illustrative excerpts from the case descriptions are presented. The complete cases are contained in Part B of this volume, which is published separately. For ease in handling the presentation and discussion of the findings, the target students have been grouped according to the participation category that was judged to describe best the way in which they participated in their sixth-grade classes. After discussing the participation of each subgroup of target students, trends across the groups will be considered.

Students Rated as Alienate Participants in Grade Six

Four of the target students (Students A5, A6, A7, and A8) were rated by their sixth-grade teachers as alienate participants in grade six. As noted in Table 2.2, most of these students continued to exhibit alienate characteristics in their seventh-grade classes as well. Only Student A6 did not. This suggests that in grade seven these students almost never attended to assigned tasks, almost always disrupted their neighbors, almost never began another task when assigned work was completed, and needed frequent monitoring by the teacher to stay on-task. Interestingly, two target students (A5 and A8) received both alienate and phantom participation ratings from their seventh-grade teachers. In the classes where such double ratings occurred, it appears that the students did not interrupt the teacher and others by shouting out answers but exhibited the other alienate characteristics. A discussion follows of the participation of these four target students. It begins with Target Student A5. (The first student listed on Table 2.2 based on the student identification system used in the study.)

Table 2.2

Seventh Grade Participation Categories of Target Students Rated as Alienate Participants in Sixth Grade

TARGET STUDENT	CLASSROOM PARTICIPATION RATING											
	Sixth Grade	Seventh-Grade Classes in Which Observed										
		AA	AB	AC	AD	AE	AF	AG	AH	AI	AJ	AK
A5 Male	Alienate	Phantom/ Alienate			Phantom/ Alienate				Social/ Alien-ate/ Phantom			Depen-dent/ Phantom
A6 Male	Alienate		Phantom*		Phantom							Phantom
A7 Male	Alienate					Alienate		Alienate				
A8 Male	Alienate					Phantom/ Alienate	Depen-dent/ Phantom		Phantom/ Alienate		Alienate	

*This rating was given by the observer. No teacher rating was available.

Student A5. Student A5 was one of the target students who was rated as an alienate in grade six and was judged by his seventh grade teachers to exhibit both alienate behaviors and behaviors that were indicative of other participation categories. Hence, although Student A5 was considered to be disruptive by the teachers, he apparently went about disturbing the teacher and other students in different ways in his various classes. In fact, in Teacher AK's home economics class, he was not rated as an alienate participant at all. A check of his case description provides some insights into the participation characteristics Student A5 exhibited.

An excerpt from an observation in Teacher AA's English class illustrates the type of behavior that led to a phantom/alienate rating by this teacher:

> Most of the students worked on the assignment, but Student A5 put his sunglasses on and then, in order to put some paper in the trashbasket, walked across the classroom... A moment later, a student called out across the room to the teacher that the teacher should look at Student A5 because of his glasses.

Another excerpt provides further evidence:

> While Teacher AA is explaining the directions [for the day's work], Student A5 and the boys in front of him and behind him are pushing their chairs back and forth against each other; apparently carrying on a quarrel that began before class.

Similar sorts of quiet, but disruptive, behavior were observed in Teacher AD's math class, where Student A5 also was given both an alienate and a phantom participation rating. For example:

> During this period, Student A5 has been sailing a paper airplane across the room.

On another day, the observer noted:

> While the teacher was reading the homework assignment, Student A5 was looking out the window, tapping his pen on the desk. At one point, he turned to a boy behind him and urged him to "say it out loud," referring to the boy's talking about "Buggsie" under his breath. (Buggsie was a derogatory name the students used to refer to Teacher AD.)

Another example shows a somewhat more obvious attempt to disturb the class. The observer commented:

> He begins sneezing, looking around to see who is watching him. He bangs his hand on his desk several times. Once he calls out, "Buggsie." Another time he drops his book on the floor. After each disruption, he looks around to see if anyone has noticed him.

Student A5's reading skills teacher rated him as exhibiting not only alienate and phantom, but also social participation characteristics. Thus, while he appears to have maintained his alienate behavior in this class, he seems to have done so in a variety of ways, some of which were social and some of which were phantom in nature. For example, the observer in this class often described Student A5 as being off-task. In addition, the narratives include frequent notations that Student A5 had completed the assignment by "copying the paper of the boy to his right." Numerous examples of the teacher reprimanding Student A5 also are in the case description. An observer comment that illustrates the ways in which Student A5 attempted to disturb this class follows:

> Once back to his seat, Student A5 began working with another student on an extra credit assignment... When he finished his extra credit work, he began reading a magazine, Field and Stream, the same one that he had read previously. As he read it, he made a number of comments, apparently to no one in particular, and designed solely to draw attention to himself.

Perhaps because the structure of the home economics class allowed students opportunities to interact with other students without teacher sanctions, Student A5 was not rated as an alienate student in this class. Here, he received a dependent/phantom rating. Nonetheless, the observation narratives include many examples of Student A5 talking with other students about non-academic matters. They also contain frequent instances of irrelevant comments made during class discussions. For example:

> The teacher asks, "What utensil did I use to level out the flour?"
> Student A5 calls out, "Knife."
> Teacher AK says, "Be sure you turn the mixer on low or there'll be a big cloud."
> Student A5 says loudly, "An atom bomb!" He continues, "It looks so dry, man."

Hence, Student A5's participation in his seventh-grade classes appears to have been characterized by low attention to assigned tasks, much emphasis on seeking the attention of his peers, and antagonistic relationships with some teachers. All these features describe a student who continued to be an alienate participant in junior high school.

Student A6. Target Student A6 is the only target student who was rated as an alienate participant in grade six who received no such ratings in the seventh-grade classes is which he was observed. He was rated as a phantom participant in all three of these seventh-grade classes. The phantom ratings suggest that Student A6 seldom worked with others or initiated interaction with them. In addition, he seldom contributed to the progress of the lesson, and almost never volunteered to answer the teacher's questions. However, one might expect that he was liked by his peers. Several excerpts from the case description for this student support these ratings. For example, the observer made the following comments regarding his behavior in his English class:

> Student A6 worked in a serious and concentrated manner. A question from another student was dealt with briefly with just a nod of the head.

On another occasion:

> The students were talking out of turn and finally the noise got to such a level that the teacher paused to wait for quiet. Student A6 did not contribute to the noise, but was smiling.

Similar comments were included in the description of Student A6's participation in his math class. For example:

> Though there was talking in the class, Student A6 continued to sit quietly. During one five-minute observation period, he did very little but work assiduously.

During another observation period, the obeserver reported:

> As Student A6 worked, a student tried to attract his attention, but Student A6 ignored him and continued working.

Even in home economics, Student A6 was quieter than most other students, although he did talk with others in this class. For example, the observer stated:

> Student A6 leaned over to tell one of his companions what the date was. He continued to whisper to his neighbor throughout the period. Thus, signs of a participation pattern that differed from that observed in the math class were noted.

Based on the data in the case description for Student A6, and illustrated in the excerpts provided above, in seventh grade Student A6 appears to have behaved in a manner consistent with his

categorization as a phantom participant. Thus, he seemingly functioned differently in junior high school than he did in his elementary sixth-grade class.

Student A7. Student A7 was the target student who showed no change in his participation in seventh-grade. He was rated as an alienate participant by his sixth-grade teacher and by the teachers in the two classes in which he was observed in grade seven. Excerpts from his case description illustrate his behavior in seventh grade. For example, the following excerpt provides insight into his participation in Teacher AE's math class:

> Teacher AE found one problem was wrong and talked to Student A7 about how he should correct it. When the teacher walked away, the observer noted, "Student A7 hits his hand on the desk. He is frustrated."

Student A7's participation in his world history class was somewhat different than that in the math class. In the history class, he seemed to be even more disruptive. For example, the following behavior occurred during an ongoing class discussion:

> Student A7 is in the back of the class. He is taking off his shirt and putting on his football shirt. He leans back over the side of his desk and packs his shirt in his bag. He stands up and tucks his shirt in.
> Teacher AG calls out, "Student A7, I really wish you would do that some other time than now."
> Student A7's neighbors laugh at him. He sits down.

Interaction between Teacher AG and Student A7 during a class discussion further illustrates the student's participation:

> Teacher AG asks Student A7, "What did you put for number two?"
> Student A7 says, "I didn't put anything."
> The teacher asks, "What is an intermittent stream?"
> Student A7 says, "I don't know."

By the end of the first quarter of the school year, the case description notes that Student A7 was raising his hand to answer some questions but also continuing to call out many answers. In addition, he frequently was coming to class without the necessary books, pencils, or paper. All these behaviors are characteristic of an alienate participant, particularly if Student A7 was purposely arriving at class unprepared in order to avoid doing the assigned work.

Student A8. The teachers who taught the seventh-grade classes in which Student A8 was observed gave him a variety of participation

ratings. Two teachers indicated he was an alienate/phantom. One rated him an alienate only. One indicated he was a dependent/phantom. A brief discussion follows of his behavior in these various classes.

In Teacher AE's math class, Student A8 was observed annoying one student, in particular, on frequent occasions. For example:

> Student A8 began annoying Vince by putting his left hand on Vince's books and turning the workbook pages.

On another day, the following episode was described:

> Student A8 attempts to push another book off Vince's desk, and Vince calls out loudly, "Stop it, Student A8!"

Even after Teacher AE changed the seating assignments for the two students, Student A8 continued to be disruptive:

> At this point, halfway through the period, Student A8 drifted off-task. He turned to talk to a neighbor. The teacher quickly rebuked him but he was not deterred. He talked with the neighbor and made faces at him. Next he rolled his paper into a tube. The neighbor apparently thought this quite clever for he left his seat and took the tube from Student A8. They continued to play with the tube until the end of the period, sliding their pencils in the tube, throwing the tube on the floor, trying to step on it, and so forth. The play and disruption spread to those around them.

Given the above descriptions, it appears that Student A8 may not have been as quiet about his disruptive behavior in the math class as Teacher AE's alienate/phantom rating would suggest. The appropriateness of the alienate rating is obvious, however.

The other class in which Student A8 was rated alienate/phantom was his reading skills class. Again, numerous examples of disruptive behavior occurred. However, they appeared to involve less loud talking than those in the math class. Hence, inclusion of a phantom as well as an alienate rating may have been accurate for this setting. An example follows in which Student A8 does quiet things that disturb the other students involved in a listening activity:

> The students are doing a listening activity. The teacher has started the recording. Student A8 taps on the table. He adjusts the sound up and down. He continues to change

the volume. He plays with his paper, plays with the machine, and plays with his book.

Several instances were noted by the observer in this class in which Student A8 had confrontations with other students. These often involved Student A5 (another target student who was rated as an alienate participant). However, for purposes of illustration, an interaction with another student is excerpted below because it demonstrates the readiness for a fight that Student A8 exhibited:

> Someone pushes Student A8 a little to move over and he runs after him and pushes him hard.
>
> The student who got pushed says, "Calm down, Student A8. All I did was ask you to move."
>
> Student A8 says, "You pushed me!"
>
> The teacher goes to talk with Student A8.

In his history class, the teacher's alienate rating of Student A8's behavior appears to have been appropriate, as the following excerpt points out:

> Student A8 is talking and playing with the three boys right around him ... They are getting in and out of their desks, reaching over one anothers' desks, and talking loudly.

Teacher AF, Student A8's art teacher, did not rate Student A8 as an alienate. Rather, he judged him to be a dependent/phantom. Such a rating indicates that a student needs frequent assistance and feedback from the teacher in order to remain on-task. Further, since a phantom student cannot be expected to seek this assistance on his own, whatever help and support are given to the student would need to be the result of teacher initiated interaction. Since Teacher AF allowed the students somewhat more flexibility in regard to talking with others and moving about the room than most other seventh-grade teachers, Student A8's frequent discussions with others may not have been as disruptive in this class as in the others described above. For example:

> Student A8 approaches his task in a fitful manner. He interrupts his work on his project by breaking his pencil into small parts, talking to the boy behind him, and talking to the boys in the back of the room. When he is not involved in such off-task behavior, Student A8 works on his project, finishing his sketch.

The next excerpt indicates that, although Student A8 may have needed and wanted assistance and recognition from the teacher, the reactions to such attention often were disruptive as well:

Teacher AF notices Student A8's work and says, "That one is pretty good, why don't you work on that?"

As soon as the teacher leaves, Mark (a boy sitting near Student A8) crumbles up the just-praised paper and throws it in the wastebasket.

Student A8 retaliates in kind with Mark's paper.

Thus, for the most part, Student A8 seems to have continued to function as an alienate participant in his junior high school classes.

Summary. Based on these findings, it appears that most of the target students who were rated as alienate participants in grade six continued to participate in much the same manner in grade seven. Even though some teachers found them to interact with others infrequently (phantom participation) or to need alot of assistance from the teacher in order to stay on-task (dependent participation), they still rated the students as also disrupting the class in the ways that alienate students would be expected to do. Only Student A6 failed to show alienate behaviors at the junior high school level. Because of his change in behavior, it will be interesting to pursue his level of success compared with that of the other three students in this group (see later discussion in Chapter Three).

Students Rated as Phantom Participants in Grade Six

Target Students A9, A10, A11, and A12 were rated as phantom participants by their sixth-grade teachers. This suggests that in grade six, these students almost never volunteered to answer the teacher's questions, seldom worked with other students on assigned work, almost never initiated conversations with other students, almost never acted as peer teachers, but, nonetheless were somewhat liked by their peers.

Referring to Table 2.3, it is apparent that three of the students continued to exhibit phantom participation characteristics in their seventh-grade classes. These were Students A9, A11, and A12. One student, Student A10, was judged to be a success student by the teachers in the two classes in which he was observed. Students A11 and A12 were rated by some teachers as exhibiting both phantom and success characteristics. Given the classes in which these two students were observed, this combination of characteristics is not unexpected. The teachers who gave such dual ratings were teachers who (a) established and enforced a rigid set of rules and norms -- Teachers AB, AI, and AJ; or (b) in the case of Teacher AE, set rules, but enforced them somewhat haphazardly. Since little interaction was allowed in the "rigid" classes, most students were required to function as phantom participants

in order to avoid teacher sanctioning. Further, the uncertainty of rule enforcement in Teacher AE's class undoubtedly made phantom participation a "safe" mode of behavior in this class as well. For students A11 and A12, therefore, the ratings that are of interest are not the phantom ratings, but the shift to the success characteristics.

Table 2.3

Seventh Grade Participation Categories of Target Students Rated as Phantom Participants in Sixth Grade

TARGET STUDENT	CLASSROOM PARTICIPATION RATING											
	Sixth Grade	Seventh-Grade Classes in Which Observed										
		AA	AB	AC	AD	AE	AF	AG	AH	AI	AJ	AK
A9 Male	Phantom	Phantom/ Isolate	Phantom*			Phantom						
A10 Male	Phantom						Success				Success	
A11 Female	Phantom		Success/ Phantom*			Success/ Phantom					Success/ Phantom	
A12 Female	Phantom									Success/ Phantom*	Success/ Phantom Phantom/ Isolate**	

* This rating was given by the observer. No teacher rating was available for this class.
** This teacher taught two subjects. This target student was observed in both subjects.

A description follows of each of the above students participation in the seventh-grade classes in which (s)he was oabserved. The narrative excerpts are taken from the case descriptions for each student.

Student A9. The data in Table 2.3 suggest that Student A9 not only continued to participate as a phantom student, in Teacher AA's English class the teacher also rated him as an isolate participant. Thus, he appears to have become even more withdrawn in this class than he was in his sixth-grade class. Interestingly, the observation narratives for the first week of seventh-grade indicate that Student A9 did not begin the class in this manner. The narratives describe Student A9 raising his hand to answer questions asked by the teacher and talking with the students who were sitting around him. However, by the second week of school, Student A9 was described as "not interacting with anyone in the classroom," and "being totally immobile during the [entire] period of observation." The observer further commented that Student A9 requested a seat change in order to move away from students who were interrupting him by attempting to talk with him.

In his history and math classes, Student A9 exhibited similar behaviors. Observation narratives for these classes include statements such as the following in the history class: "[Student A9] is very absorbed in his task. He [does] not look around at all." On the fifth day of the school year, the observer commented that Student A9 had participated in his first interaction with other students in the history class. This occurred while Student A9 was collecting papers from the students (at the teacher's request). However, as the year progressed, Student A9 began talking with some of the students in this class. Still, these interactions were less frequent than those carried on by most students in the class.

In math, the observer's statements regarding Student A9 included comments such as: "He did not interact with another student or the teacher," "He watched other students who were talking but did not participate in the conversation," and "Student A9 has been quiet all this time."

Hence, the phantom ratings given to Student A9 are supported by the observation narratives. He apparently continued to interact with others as infrequently in grade seven as he had done in grade six.

Student A10. Inasmuch as Student A10 was rated as a success/multitask participant by the two seventh-grade teachers in whose classes he was observed, he could be expected to interact with others for instructional purposes and to participate in class discussions more readily than the other students who were rated as phantom participants in grade six. He also could be expected to be on-task much of the time, be accurate in his responses to teacher questions, and complete assigned work correctly. The observation narratives suggest that this type of participation, in fact, occurred. For example, in Teacher AJ's history class he volunteered to answer the teacher's questions and did so correctly. An illustrative excerpt from the case description follows:

> Student A10 watches the teacher.
> The teacher says, "What sea lies between Sweden and the USSR?"
> Student A10 says, "The Baltic Sea."
> The teacher tells him the answer is correct.

In this class, Student A10 also worked with other students when necessary and moved on to other assignments without prodding from the teacher. For instance:

> Student A10 and another boy are sharing an atlas. Student A10 finishes today's assignment and hands it in. He goes to the teacher's desk and gets tomorrow's assignment. He reads through it and begins working on it.

Similar sorts of participation were observed in Teacher AF's art class. The case description includes examples of Student A10 initiating interaction with the teacher:

> Student A10 is in line to show the teacher his completed design.
> Teacher AF says, "Good!"
> Student A10 says, "Can I start another one?"
> Teacher AF says, "Yes, by all means."

He also was described as concentrating on assigned tasks:

> Student A10 continues his work on his drawing. Now he turns his paper over and begins drawing his cartoon character. He works on this task without stopping. He does not even talk to his partner.

Hence, the ratings of Student A10 as a success participant appear to be accurate. Although he was reserved in his interactions with others, he initiated more contacts than would be expected of a phantom participant. He also moved on to new work without prodding from the teacher and responded to the teachers' questions in ways that were typical more of success than phantom participation.

Student A11. Student A11 was rated as both a phantom and a success student by the three seventh-grade teachers in whose classes she was observed. Possible explanations for the likelihood that such a combination would occur were presented above. Illustrative excerpts in the case description for Student A11 indicate that the phantom characteristics definitely applied in all three classes. For example, consider the following excerpt from Teacher AB's English class:

> Student A11 is very, very methodical in the way she is going about the task. She makes lines with her pencil, measuring everything, measuring the folds as she does them. She unfolds the cover and puts the book in, measuring it again, extremely slowly and methodically. Others are covering their books much more rapidly but not as neatly. Student A11 is still working. Others are finished. She is cutting slowly and carefully.

This excerpt from the observations in Teacher AE's math class also supports a phantom rating:

> Student A11 is silent. She watches the teacher helping a neighbor girl to her right. She gets up higher in her chair on her knees so she can see the girl's

> paper. She leans over to her right. Then she looks at her own paper and almost starts to erase, but doesn't.

As further evidence of Student A11's quietness in class, the following excerpt is taken from the observations in Teacher AJ's history class. This description also contains some behaviors that are typical of success participation.

> Student A11 is working alone. She shifts her weight in her seat. She does not take her eyes off the paper. She hums to herself as she works. She rocks slightly in the seat. She marks an answer on the paper. Her legs are crossed. She swings her left leg. She's working on tomorrow's assignment which means that she has yesterday and today's work already done.

Examples of success behavior are found the in the case descriptions for the other two classes as well. The following illustrative excerpt from the English class includes examples of both phantom and success behavior:

> Student A11 completes her grammar work and moves on, without instruction, to her vocabulary assignment. She continues to stay on-task, working independently. The other students around her are asking the teacher alot of questions. Student A11 does not ask any questions.

The next example is from the math class:

> The teacher is asking questions about exponents. Student A11 volunteers with her hand up, stretched way out. She seems eager to answer.

Based on the data contained in her case description and illustrated above, it appears that Student A11 continued to participate as a phantom student in her seventh-grade classes. On the other hand, while the case description includes examples of success participation, these were much less frequent than those characteristic of phantom behavior. Hence, the teachers' ratings on these charateristics need to be considered in relation to the success of other students in the same classes and, as mentioned earlier, in relation to the rigid rules systems in operation in the classes.

Student A12. Student A12 was observed in the reading skills class taught by Teacher AI and in two of Teacher AJ's classes, math fundamentals and history. In two of these classes, reading skills and math fundamentals, Student A12 was rated as exhibiting both phantom and success participation characteristics. In contrast, in history she was rated as a phantom/isolate participant.

Student A12's case description includes several examples of phantom participation in the reading skills class. One of these follows:

> Student A12 works independently on her own. She does not look up or look around. She does not interact with her neighbor. She seems oblivious to the rest of the class.

Although she also received a success rating in this class, no examples of success participation were included in the observation narratives in the case description. This is an interesting finding inasmuch as the rating reported for Student A12 in reading skills was given by the observer (Teacher AI did not rate his students).

Student A12 also showed phantom characteristics in the math fundamentals class. The following example is almost a duplicate of one from the reading skills class quoted above:

> Student A12 does not interact with anyone around her throughout the period. She seems fairly oblivious of her neighbors.

Another excerpt from the case description suggests that Student A12 not only may have been very quiet in math, she also may have needed to be pushed to participate:

> The teacher asks, "Is there anyone who didn't put the 9 first?"
> Several students raise their hands. Student A12, who did not place the 9 correctly, seems to hesitate. The girl behind her looks at her paper and motions with her hand for Student A12 to raise her hand. Student A12 raises her arm a little.

Again, no examples of success participation were included in the case description for this class.

The rating for the history class suggests that Student A12 was extremely quiet and withdrawn in this situation. Several statements in the case description support this view:

> In spite of the difficulty Student A12 appears to be having with the assignment, she is not asking the teacher or other students for help.

On another occasion:

> Teacher AJ asks, "Okay, Row 1, what continent is Chile it? Student A12?"

Student A12 is looking at the continent of Asia on the map for the answer to the question.

Another student answers for her, "South America."

Student A12 does not become involved verbally. She continues to look up places in the atlas as the teacher asks questions.

Later in the year when an assignment was returned, Student A12 failed to respond when another student spoke to her:

The girl in front of Student A12 turns and says, "I got a minus on this because I didn't have any pictures. I think I should have gotten at least a check."

Student A12 listens quietly. She stares out into space and then returns to her assignment, a crossword puzzle.

The case description suggests that Student A12 was behaving in ways that characterize a phantom student in all three classes in which she was observed. Thus, despite the success ratings she received in two of the classes, she seems to have continued to perform in grade seven much as she did in grade six.

Summary. For the most part, the target students who were rated as phantom participants by their sixth-grade teachers continued to exhibit these same characteristics in seventh grade. Even Student A10, who was rated as a success participant, could be described as a quiet student, compared with other students in the class. Further, Students A9 and A12 seemed to withdraw from participation even more markedly when the academic tasks assigned were difficult. In these instances, they behaved as isolates. Such behavior is significant because, as isolate students, they would be less apt to receive the teacher assistance necessary to complete such tasks successfully than they would as phantom or phantom/success students.

Students Rated as Dependent Participants in Grade Six

As discussed earlier, eight target students were selected who were rated as dependent participants by their sixth-grade teachers. These students, therefore, might be expected to attend to academic tasks only when the teacher or others provided frequent assistance and feedback. Further, one might anticipate that they would rely upon their peers for academic help whenever the teacher was unavailable. They also might be expected to ask the teacher or others if their work were correct. Such feedback most likely would be requested on a regular and frequent basis. In terms of participation in classroom discussions or demonstrations, these students probably would be most involved when they were in small group situations and when manipulable materials were used. If

the frequent encouragement and assistance mentioned above were not provided, these students might be expected to stop working until such time as attention or help was forthcoming. Hence, the presence or absence of the instructional features that differentiated among the seventh-grade classrooms might be expected to influence both the form and the outcomes of these target students' participation in the seventh-grade classes to which they were assigned. In particular, one might hypothesize that the extent to which the teacher was accessible to these students would be of particular importance. The discussion that follows presents information about these students' actual participation in their classes.

Perusal of Table 2.4 indicates that the target students who were rated as dependent participants in grade six (Students A13 through A20) were judged by their seventh-grade teachers to participate in classroom instructional activities in a wide variety of ways. Each student was rated as participating differently in at least one class compared with the others in which (s)he was observed. Some students were rated as exhibiting different participation characteristics in each class in which they were observed. Nonetheless, the predominant participation rating for these students appears to be that of a phantom. This is a matter of some concern inasmuch as phantom participants would not be expected to initiate the interactions with the teacher and others necessary to obtain the frequent feedback and reinforcement needed by dependent students. The discussion that follows looks at the participation across classes for each of the target students in this group. It considers the extent to which the student's observed participation behavior is consistent with the teachers' ratings.

Student A13. Student A13 was rated by her English teacher (Teacher AA) as exhibiting the participation characteristics of a success and a social student. Such ratings, while different from those of a dependent student, are not inconsistent with the forms of interaction one might expect from a student who needs frequent help and feedback. If Student A13 initiated the interaction with the teacher or others needed to obtain help and reinforcement, she might be considered to be a social student. Further, if the required assistance and support were provided, Student A13 might remain on-task and complete her work successfully, thereby performing as a success student. The following excerpts from Student A13's case description provide insight into the ways in which she was actually observed to participate in the English class. They suggest that at the beginning of the year Student A13 was less social than the teacher's rating would indicate. She also appears to have had difficulty with some of the assignments. Later, interaction with another student in the class seems to have provided the help Student A13 needed and to have established a participation pattern of the sort suggested above. For example, the following comments were recorded by the observer during the second week of the school year:

> Student A13 worked throughout the period. She had some trouble with the alphabetical ordering of the words...She seemed to have

Table 2.4

Seventh Grade Participation Categories
of Target Students Rated as
Dependent Participants in Sixth Grade

TARGET STUDENT	CLASSROOM PARTICIPATION RATING											
	Sixth Grade	Seventh-Grade Classes in Which Observed										
		AA	AB	AC	AD	AE	AF	AG	AH	AI	AJ	AK
A13 Female	Dependent	Success/ Social			Dependent/ Phantom						Phantom	
A14 Female	Dependent	Phantom/ Alienate	Phantom*		Phantom/ Alienate*							
A15 Male	Dependent/ Social	Dependent	Phantom/ Isolate*		Phantom/ Isolate							
A16 Male	Dependent		Alienate/Dependent/ Phantom*			Social					Alienate	
A17 Female	Dependent		Success/ Phantom*							Social/ Dependent*	Phantom	
A18 Female	Dependent		No Rating		Phantom/ Isolate						Phantom	
A19 Male	Dependent	Dependent/ Phantom									Dependent/ Phantom	
A20 Female	Dependent		Success/ Phantom*		Success*							

* This rating was given by the observer. No teacher rating was available for this class.

trouble remembering which words she had used and which remained to be defined.

Later in November, the observer commented:

> Student A13 is listening as the teacher reads. She's writing with her head to one side and her tongue out. She looks at the teacher, stretches her fingers, and continues writing.

During this same observation, Student A13 was described as interacting briefly with the students around her. Further, the next day, the observer stated that Student A13 seemed to be interacting frequently with a girl who sat near her. This girl seemed to be the more assertive of the two and to initiate the conversations with Student A13. Regardless of who instigated the interaction,

the students were observed working together in a manner that provided help and reinforcement to Student A13.

Student A13's math teacher judged her to be a dependent student who also exhibited the quiet characteristics of a phantom participant. Since this is the teacher who established none of the instructional features that were found to differentiate among the seventh-grade classes, such participation characteristics might suggest that Student A13 would have problems in this class. Perhaps fortunately for Student A13, the observation narratives suggest that she interacted with other students in this class more frequently than would be expected of a phantom student. Apparently she used several students as a source of help and feedback. For example:

> [Student A13] looked at the problems that had been marked wrong. Two of the problems she reworked, then she counted the number that were marked wrong. She turned around to talk with Student A28.

During another observation:

> She turned and pulled the chair and desk of the student behind her up closer to hers so that she could talk to the student...The boy in front of her helped Student A13, correcting her work for her.

It must be noted, however, that on several occasions the observer described Student A13 as working quietly without interacting with others, as illustrated in the following excerpt:

> Student A13 had her notebook out and started copying the problems into the notebook as soon as the assignment had been given...She continued working, concentrating on the problems. She did not talk to anyone around her or in front of her. She just concentrated on doing the problems.

Student A13's history teacher rated her as a phantom participant. However, while she generally worked quietly on assigned tasks, several of the observation narratives suggest that Student A13 sought help and reinforcement in this classroom as well. For instance:

> After Student A13 has worked for awhile, she gets up and gets in line to talk to the teacher. She says to the teacher, "I don't think I'm doing this right."

Such interactions with the teacher occurred during many observations. In addition, the observer often described Student A13

working with a girl who sat near her. Hence, Student A13's observed behavior in this class seems to have been more that of a dependent student than as a phantom participant.

Based on the above case description data, Student A13 might best be described as a student who continued to seek frequent help and assistance and feedback from others in her seventh-grade classes. In two of the classes in which she was observed, she obtained most of this support from other students. In the history class, she sought help from the teacher as well.

Student A14. Student A14 was rated as a phantom participant in three of the classes in which she was observed. In addition, in two of the classes she was rated as exhibiting the disruptive characteristics of an alienated participant. It is important to note that two of her teachers did not provide participation ratings. Thus, for these classes the ratings listed in Table 2.4 are those of the classroom observers

Early in the school year in her English class, Student A14 was described as working quietly on her assigned tasks, which was consistent with the phantom rating given by her teacher. For example:

> She appears to be concentrating intensely on the assignment. She has not yet looked up from the page. She takes her hand off her chin to look at the place where she is to write her answers. She puts her hand back down on the paper to write. She continues to work until she finishes the assignment. She then proceeds to work on her homework from other classes.

As the year progressed, Student A14 was observed interacting with other students. These interactions were not always friendly, an indication that Student A14 may have exhibited some of the alienate characteristics credited to her by Teacher AA. For instance, the following excerpt shows Student A14 being taunted by one of her classmates:

> Student A14 drops her assignment sheet on the floor. As she leans forward to pick it up, she talks to Karla about it.
>
> Karla turns around and points to something on the assignment sheet, saying, "That dummy!"
>
> Student A14 replies, "I'm not stupid!"
>
> Karla turns to the front again; and Student A14 begins to work.

Sometimes Student A14 sought help from other students:

> Student A14 is sitting at her desk staring at the wall. She may be looking at the announcements pinned to the wall. Then she looks in her bag. She turns around to Andy, who sits behind her, and talks to him. I think she is asking him what work they are supposed to be doing. Then she turns and picks up her books and her folder. She takes a paper out of her folder. She takes a number of sheets out, most of which appear to be blank. She seems to be rearranging her work in the folder.

Hence, in her English class, Student A14 seems to have started the year as a phantom participant but increased in her interaction with others as time progressed.

The observer in Student A14's history class indicated that she exhibited phantom participation characteristics. The observation narratives provide evidence to support such a rating. For example, during the latter part of September the observer stated that Student A14 behaved passively when she did not get a part in a play that was to be read. This was in marked contrast to the other students who were throwing their arms around and calling out that they wanted a part. In November, the observer noted that Student A14's demeanor was serious and that she did not talk with any of her neighbors.

The observer in Student A14's mathematics class also rated her as a phantom participant. She was judged to be an alienate participant in this class as well. The observation narratives include several examples of Student A14 attempting to obtain assistance from Teacher AD. As Teacher AD ignored the student's requests for assistance, Student A14 used strategies that might be considered unacceptable. For example:

> Student A14 turned and checked her paper with the girl sitting behind her, then raised her hand, yawning. First one hand and then the other was raised, as she tried to get the teacher's attention. Continuing to talk to the girl behind her, she sarted to snap her fingers. Then she happened to catch the observer's eye. She stopped talking and stood up, with her hand still in the air, trying harder still to get Teacher AD's attention. At the end of the five minute observation period, she still had not obtained the teacher's attention.

By November, Student A14 was spending most of the class period passing notes to other students and talking with those around her, as illustrated by the following excerpt from the observation narrative:

> Student A14 talks to another student, and then sits watching a boy blowing bubbles with his chewing gum. She puts her head on her hand, talks to the student across the aisle, points to the board work, then turns back to the student. Next she watches what is going on in the class. She begins to write a note to a girl across the aisle. She spends five minutes writing the note and passes it across the aisle in a container, which the students appear to have brought to school for this purpose. Student A14 continues in this manner until Teacher AD passes her desk and asks if she has started work.

Although Student A14 appears to have interacted with other students in her math class on a regular basis, it must be noted that Teacher AD's classes frequently were out-of-control. Thus, her talking may have been more quiet than that of most other students, a factor that may have contributed to the phantom rating. At the same time, however, Student A14 definitely was part of the covert misbehavior that went on the the class, e.g., the note passing. Hence, the alienate rating also seems appropriate.

Regardless of the participation ratings she received, Student A14 received frequent feedback and help from either the teacher or other students in her English and history classes. The need for such support is typical of dependent participants. Accordingly, it seems reasonable to assume that some of the dependent characteristics she exhibited in grade six continued to prevail in grade seven, even though she was not rated as a dependent participant by Teacher AA or the observers in the other two classes.

Student A15. Teacher AA rated Student A15 as a dependent participant in his English class. For the most part, the observation narratives indicate that Student A15 frequently sought assistance, which is a dependent characteristic. However, the narratives further indicate that Student A15 generally went to other students for help rather than to the teacher. He particularly seemed to seek approval and assistance from a boy named Mike, who sat near him. The following excerpts from the observation narratives illustrate the types of interaction that occurred:

> Student A15 turns to Mike and talks inadudibly with him.

Another time:

> Student A15 thumbs through his work. He looks at Mike, gestures to him, stands, and goes over to his desk to talk to him.

On some occasions, Mike helped Student A15:

> Student A15 looks at his vocabulary sheet and waves it at Mike. Mike takes it to look at it and says, "You didn't divide them into the syllables."

In his history class, Student A15 did not interact as frequently with other students as he did in the English class. This may have been the result of the more rigid rules and norms established and enforced by Teacher AB. However, the case description includes numerous examples of Student A15 seeking help from the teacher. It also presents episodes in which Student A15 volunteered to answer the teacher's questions. Although neither of these behaviors is typical of a phantom/isolate, which is the participation rating the observer gave Student A15 in this class, the general pattern of behavior exhibited by Student A15 was quiet, with little interaction with other students. Such participation is representative of phantom behavior. The following excerpts from the case description illustrate his ways of working in this classroom.

> [Student A15] does not look very absorbed but he is quiet. He's busy copying and is not able to volunteer to answer the question the teacher is discussing with the students because he is still writing the answer to the first one.

On another observation day:

> Student A15 is concentrating on the reading. He is using his finger to follow the print on the page. He is moving his lips as he reads. He listens to the teacher. He shoots his hand up enthusiastically when the teacher asks a question, acting eager to answer it. He is called on by the teacher and contributes a correct answer.

In the following episode, Student A15 attempts to obtain Teacher AB's attention:

> Student A15 has his hand up for the teacher's attention although the class has not started. The teacher observes his hand and asks him to put it down and wait for directions.
>
> Student A15 puts his hand down but raises it again and keeps it up all through the teacher's explanation of the agenda...Student A15's hand continues to be in the air for several minutes.
>
> Teacher AB finally says, "Student A15, can't it wait?" Then she tells the students that if they have personal problems, they should try to arrange to see her before or after class so that she can help them solve them.

> Student A15 obviously didn't hear what the teacher said because he continues to hold his hand up and announces his personal problem. He tells the teacher that he left his binder and all of his work in his locker.

As a final example for this class, consider the following interaction in which Student A15 both volunteers an answer and seeks assistance:

> Student A15 is volunteering to answer. He is called upon. Teacher AB corrects his response; his answer was incomplete. Student A15 then raises his hand and asks a question concerning the procedure for scoring the worksheets. The teacher answers his question.

Student A15 participated in his math class in much the same manner that he did in the history class. This similarity in behavior is interesting because the two classes differed in several ways. As discussed previously, Teacher AD's math classes were noted for their lack of rule enforcement and the general rowdiness of the students. Teacher AB's classes, on the other hand, were based on a rigid set of rules and norms. Further, Teacher AD seldom responded to students' requests for assistance; Teacher AB did. Regardless, Student A15 volunteered to answer the teacher's questions, attempted to obtain help from the teacher, and, even in this disorderly setting, seldom talked with other students. Hence the phantom/isolate participation rating given by the teacher may have been appropriate within a setting that included the extensive amount of disruptive interaction that occurred among most of the students in Teacher AD's classes. The following summary comment by the observer exemplifies Student A15's behavior in his math class:

> Student A15 has attempted to interact with the other students in the classroom but has been fairly unsuccessful. He attempts to talk to them but is ususally ignored or they laugh at him. Sometimes they answer with a response to make others around him laugh... There is little interaction between Student A15 and Teacher AD, although Student A15 frequently goes to the teacher's desk and frequently has his hand in the air. So far, he has been brushed off by the teacher. Teacher AD does not interact much with him.

Thus, Student A15, while rated as a phantom/isolate in two of his classes and a dependent participant in one, actually appears to have manifested the characteristics of a dependent student in all three classes in which he was observed. Unfortunately, when he attempted to interact with other students and obtain help from them, the students in two of the classes rejected him. This, in turn, verified the phantom and isolate ratings he was given.

Student A16. Student A16 was observed in his English, math, and history classes. The participation ratings given by the teachers suggest that he was a social participant in his math class and an alienate in the history class. His English teacher did not rate his participation characteristics. The observer in this class rated him as exhibiting several forms of behavior including the characteristics of a dependent, an alienate, and a phantom participant. Hence, Student A16 appears to have been a different type of student in each of the classes in which he was observed. Excerpts from the case description are presented below to illustrate these differences.

In math, Student A16 often asked the teacher questions without raising his hand. For example:

> The teacher asks the students to copy the first problem.
> Student A16 asks, "Which first problem?"
> The teacher answers, "The first problem in the set."
> Student A16 then asks, "And the rest, do we write down the answers?"

Another behavior pattern that occurred frequently in the math class was a mixture of talking with his neighbors, doing his work, and making random comments to no one in particular. All these behaviors suggest that the social rating given by the teacher may have been appropriate.

In history, Student A16 seldom volunteered to answer the teacher's questions. However, he did engage in behaviors that caused the teacher to sanction him. For example:

> Student A16 brought a small toy bat. He is swinging it as he sits in his seat playing with other students. The teacher takes the bat from him and tells him to pick it up after school.

By November, the observer in this class noted that Student A16 was sitting alone in his seat which was in the corner of the room away from the other students. The observer also reported that Student A16 began acting out early in the period, making noises, and talking with no one in particular. These behaviors are indicative of the alienate participant rating given by the teacher.

Finally, in his English class Student A16 was observed seeking assistance from the teacher. He also was described to be "attending to business" during many of the observation periods. Yet, several times the observer noted that the teacher became angry with Student A16 for talking out of turn and making comments rather loudly without being called on. Thus, in this class Student A16 seems to have exhibited the wide variety of participation characteristics the observer's ratings suggest. Throughout the

observations in all three classes, an underlying theme of Student A16's participation seems to be one of attempting to obtain assistance from the teacher or from his peers. Therefore, he appears to have continued to need help and feedback in junior high school as he did in elementary school.

Student A17. Based on the ratings by Student A17's history teacher and by the observers in her English and reading skills classes, Student A17 appears to have participated somewhat differently in her various classes. In the English class, the observer clearly rated Student A17 as a phantom participant, but in addition suggested that she remained on-task and completed her work successfully with little help from the teacher (a behavior pattern that is markedly different from one that might be expected from a student who is a dependent participant). In the history class, the teacher rated Student A17 as a phantom. The observer in the reading skills class, judged her to be a dependent student who apparently obtained help in a social manner. Excerpts from the case description provide further insight into the ways Student A17 participated in these classes.

The English teacher, Teacher AB, had a reputation as a strict teacher. In this class, little interaction among students was tolerated. Hence, phantom participation would be in accordance with the classroom rules and norms. For the most part, Student A17 was observed to be on-task and quiet. For example, during one observation, Student A17 was described as remaining on-task, listening to the teacher, working on the definitions in the dictionary, and writing. On another occasion, the observer indicated that when she finished reading an assigned story, Student A17 took out her vocabulary worksheets from the previous weeks and reviewed the words. Then she began working on the new vocabulary assignment. After she had finished the assignment, she reviewed for the quiz that would be given the next day. No interaction with the teacher or with her peers was noted.

Later in the year, Student A17 was observed talking with other students for brief periods of time. However, the same general pattern of concentration on assigned work that was observed earlier in the year prevailed at this time also. For example:

> Student A17 is totally immersed in her work. She does not look around. She uses the dictionary sheet which was completed the day before for a reference, which makes her present task easier than if she had to look up every word again. She stays with her task most of the time. She talks to a boy across the row for about a second and then goes back to her task.

Hence, the phantom rating for Student A17's participation in this class appears to be supported by the observation narratives. In addition, she exhibited several success characteristics such as

moving on to new tasks without being told to do so. She was not observed seeking help from the teacher, even though Teacher AB made herself available to the students. Occasionally Student A17 sought help from other students, particularly the boy who sat across from her, but these interactions occurred only a few times during the entire study. Thus, if Student A17 had the same needs in this class that she apparently had in grade six -- e.g., a need for frequent feedback and assistance from the teacher or other students -- she probably did not receive it.

At the beginning of the school year, Student A17's behavior in her reading skills class was much like that in the history class. For instance, the second week of the school year the observer noted that Student A17 worked on her assignment throughout the period, hardly interacting with anyone, even though there was some periodic whispering among the students who sat around her. Several weeks later, however, she was described talking with other students. Often these conversations centered around the assigned work. To illustrate:

> Teacher AI assigned the students a word-search puzzle. Student A17 and the rest of the class worked on this assignment for the remainder of the period. For part of the time, Student A17 worked with the students beside her, discussing in soft voices what the items might be.

Hence, the social, dependent participation rating seems to be appropriate for this class.

In the history class, Student A17 was observed interacting with a girl who sat near her on several occasions. She also was noted to volunteer to answer the teacher's questions:

> Student A17 has her hand up. The teacher calls on a boy in front of her . . .
> Teacher AJ asks, "Name a country that borders on the Black Sea."
> Student A17 looks at her book and raises her hand.
> One of the students answers, "Turkey."
> Teacher AJ says, "Name a country that borders on the Mediterranean Sea."
> Student A17 appears impatient. She has her hand up.
> Someone answers.
> Teacher AJ says, "Name another country," and calls on Student A17.
> Student A17 says, "Liberia."
> Teacher AJ says, "Not Liberia. It is Libya."

Later in the year, Student A17 moved around the history classroom talking with other students about the assigned work. Thus,

although Teacher AJ judged her to be a phantom student, the observations suggest that Student A17, in fact, quietly sought help from other students in this class -- a participation pattern more suggestive of a dependent than a phantom student. Perhaps Teacher AJ was unaware of the frequency with which Student A17 obtained help from others because of the quietness of her interactions with them.

Student A18. Student A18's participation characteristics were rated by Teacher AD and Teacher AJ. No ratings were given for Teacher AB's class. Information follows regarding the ratings and her observed participation in the first two classes. Observation data also are reported for the class in which no ratings were given by the teacher or the observer.

It will be recalled that Teacher AD's classes generally were observed to be chaotic with little teacher control over the students' behavior. Within this environment, Student A18 did not become disruptive. The observer commented, "She is so quiet, I could lose her in the class." Other observation narratives also support this view. For example:

> Student A18 begins her subtraction facts immediately. She chews gum vigorously, looking around the room and then goes back to work, snapping her gun as she chews. As some of the other students start talking around her, she turns and says, "Sh, sh, shut up." She continues working on her paper.

Another example is:

> Student A18 works on her paper. Her attention is kept on the paper. There is a lot of noise around her. She does not turn around to talk with anyone. She sits at her desk and continues doing her work. She completes her paper.

Thus, the phantom/isolate rating given by the math teacher appears to be accurate. Whether Student A18 needed help in this class (as might be expected since she was rated as a dependent student in grade six) is difficult to determine because Teacher AD seldom provided assistance to individual students and Student A18 obviously did not seek help from the teacher or her peers. The extent to which such phantom/isolate participation was successful for Student A18 will be discussed in the next chapter.

The observation narratives from the history class suggest that in this class Student A18 was a quiet student who generally attended to her work. Communication with her peers usually was sub rosa; for example, passing notes or providing a classmate with answers on a test. The observer commented on her willingness to

"take risks" in pursuit of this type of "quiet" social life. Although such participation is somewhat out-of-line with the phantom rating given by Teacher AJ, the interactions between Student A18 and the other students may not have been readily observable to the teacher because of the manner in which they were carried out. If so, from the teacher's perspective, Student A18 may indeed have been a phantom student.

Student A18's case description includes examples of both the social and the phantom behavior patterns in this class. For example:

> Student A18 is sitting at her desk. She has a dictionary open in front of her and is writing. She is working on her assignment. She works quietly and consistently.

During another observation:

> Student A18 is sitting in her seat watching the movie and writing notes. She folds the piece of paper she's been writing on and passes it to the girl on her right. The girl looks at the teacher as she takes the note that's being passed. . . After the movie the teacher provides time for the students to work on the unit assignments. Student A18 works on her map assignment.

In her English class, Student A18 rarely was observed interacting with her peers. An illustrative excerpt from the observation narratives follows:

> The teacher tells them to read. Student A18 puts her papers aside and takes out the reader which is the state text, Projections. She starts to read the story. She is totally absorbed.

However, there were occasions when she was described seeking assistance from the teacher. For example:

> When Student A18 entered the room, she settled down to work on her vocabulary worksheet. She asked the teacher for help.

Across the three classes in which she was observed, Student A18 generally was quiet, seldom interacting with the teacher or other students. Although she was observed seeking help from Teacher AB, for the most part, Student A18 sought and received less assistance from her teachers (or her peers) than might have been expected from a student who was rated as a dependent participant in grade six.

Student A19. Teacher AA commented to the observer that Student A19 came from a family that spoke Spanish in the home and that he often had difficulty understanding the English used in the classroom. This may have contributed to Student A19's pattern of participation in his seventh-grade classes. Both Teacher AA and Teacher AJ rated Student A19 as a dependent/phantom participant. Several excerpts from the case description for this student illustrate this form of participation. For example, the following narrative shows Student A19 seeking help as might be expected of a dependent student:

> Student A19 sits down, turns to Student A21, who sits a few seats behind him, and talks. She responds.
>
> Then he opens his book and asks something of the teacher.
>
> Teacher AA replies, "No you read the story and answer these questions up here. Then you copy these onto the binder paper and underline them." (The teacher is indicating two sets of questions on the assignment sheet.)
>
> Lisa stops by Student A19's desk and talks briefly.
>
> Then Student A19 starts to read.

Student A19 seemed less willing to initiate interaction with Teacher AJ. Nevertheless, he obtained assistance in this class. For example, the observation narrative that follows shows Student A19 listening while the teacher explains the assignment to other students:

> The teacher is talking to Tony and another boy... Student A19 watches and listens to this exchange between the teacher and the two students. Then he returns to his assignment and looks at the map. He writes an answer on his paper.

He also was observed working with another student:

> Student A19 is sitting at his desk. Another boy has pulled up a chair alongside the desk. They are talking and laughing loudly with the boy to Student A19's right. They go over a list of words, calling each one out. They appear excited and restless. The two boys call out, "Patriotism."
>
> Student A19 replies, "What does the word mean, though?"
>
> The boy next to him flips through the textbook. Student A19 makes comments to him about the pictures.
>
> "Here we are right here; Roman Republic," says one of the boys.
>
> Student A19 reads over his shoulder.

The above excerpt suggests that the phantom ratings given to Student A19 may not have been as applicable as the dependent ratings. Nonetheless, he appears to have continued to need the same sort of assistance and feedback in seventh grade that he required in sixth grade.

Student A20. Student A20 was observed in her English and math classes. Neither Teacher AB, the English teacher, nor Teacher AD, the math teacher, rated Student A20's participation characteristics. The observer in the English class rated Student A20 as a success and phantom participant. The observer in the math class rated her as a success participant.

For the most part, Student A20's behavior in the English class was in accord with the success rating assigned to her by the observer. The case description shows Student A20 successfully completing assigned work, attending to task, not interrupting the teacher by calling out answers to questions, and so on. All of these characteristics are typical of a success participant. However, Student A20 interacted with her peers more frequently than would be expected of a phantom student. For example:

> Student A20 has finished writing her book card. She talks very quietly with a student next to her.
>
> She goes up to get the extra credit work. Student A20 takes both extra credit sheets... She talks to a girl who comes over to the area where the sheets are. She talks with the girl who sits in front of her.
>
> Student A20 is interrupted by another girl. She goes back to work. She looks around and then goes back to the task. She doesn't seem to be concentrating as much on the extra credit work as she did on the vocabulary assignment. She talks with a passing boy, gets up to get a drink, then goes to the bulletin board to look at posters.

The observer in the math class commented on three aspects of Student A20's behavior, all of which are examples of success participation. First, her attention to academic tasks was noted:

> Student A20 gets all her classwork done. She may not start it at the beginning of the period, but she gets it finished, and is not the last one to do so. She is very self-confident.

Second, her socialization was underlined. The observer stated that she talked informally with many students around her, wrote notes to other students, and acted as a messenger between students. Finally, the observer pointed out her pattern of working on several things at the same time:

> At times she appears rather bored, but she will find something to do. It may be talking with someone else; it may be writing something; but Student A20 seems to know what she's going to do next.

The following excerpt from her case description illustrates these features of her participation in the math class:

> Student A20 is working on her math puzzle. She has been concentrating on it; writing the numbers rapidly. She is checking her work. She turns around to check with the student behind her.
>
> Student A20 makes a sketch of another puzzle that she is going to do. Now she recopies the puzzle neatly. She completes the puzzle and finishes other parts of the assignment. She looks at the student behind her, then turns back to her desk. She puts her papers away, and sits quietly talking with another student.

Student A20's combination of attention to task and unobtrusive socializing seemed to fit well in the activity structures of the two classes in which she was observed. Although Teacher AB had a strict rule system that allowed little student interaction, the sort of quiet talking in which Student A20 was involved often was tolerated so long as a student completed the assigned work with little help from the teacher. Student A20 appeared to be able to do this. Since Teacher AD's classes typically were noisy and disruptive, the manner in which Student A20 interacted with other students in this class would probably attract little if any attention from the teacher and could be judged to be a more acceptable form of behavior than that exhibited by most other students.

Summary. Most of the target students who were rated as dependent participants by their sixth-grade teachers continued to seek assistance and feedback in their seventh-grade classes. Regardless of the ratings they received, the case descriptions contained numerous examples of these students seeking and obtaining help from their peers. Examples of such interactions with their teachers were less frequent, but they did occur. Two notable exceptions to this general pattern were Student A18 and Student A20. Student A18 seldom interacted with others and, as a result, appeared to receive less help than was needed. Student A20 seemed to function successfully with little help from the teacher. However, it must be noted that this student frequently talked with other students. From the narratives in her case description, it is not clear whether these interactions were for the purpose of socialization or to obtain assistance with the assigned tasks.

Students Rated as Social Participants in Grade Six

The target student sample included four students who were rated as social participants by their sixth-grade teachers. These were Students A21, A22, A23, and A24. Table 2.5 reports the participation ratings given by the teachers in whose classes the students were observed (or observer in those instances where a teacher did not rate a student). Looking across the four students, it is clear that no single pattern of participation occurred for any one of these students across all the classes in which (s)he was observed. Further, no single mode of participation best describes the group of students. The only participation category that was not assigned to at least one of the students was that of an isolate. All the other categories were assigned to at least one student. Hence, based on these teacher (or observer) ratings, it seems that, in many instances, these students did not continue the same patterns of behavior in grade seven that they were rated as exhibiting in grade six. Further information regarding each student's participation follows. A more extensive discussion is included in the students' case descriptions which are published as Part B of this volume.

Table 2.5

Seventh Grade Participation Categories
of Target Students Rated as
Social Participants in Sixth Grade

TARGET STUDENT	CLASSROOM PARTICIPATION RATING											
	Sixth Grade	Seventh-Grade Classes in Which Observed										
		AA	AB	AC	AD	AE	AF	AG	AH	AI	AJ	AK
A21 Female	Social	Social				Dependent/ Phantom		No Rating				
A22 Female	Social		Success/ Phantom*			Success/ Phantom		Success/ Social/ Phantom				
A23 Male	Social	Social			Alienate						Success/ Social	
A24 Male	Social			Success	Phantom*			Phantom				

* This rating was given by the observer. No teacher rating was available for this class.

Student A21. Student A21 was observed in her English, math and music classes. Her English and math teachers rated her participation characteristics, these ratings are reported above in Table 2.5. Neither the teacher nor the observer provided ratings of her participation in the music class. However, the discussion that follows provides information regarding her behavior in this class as well.

Teacher AA indicated that Student A21 was a social participant in the English class. The observation narratives in the case description support this rating. Student A21 frequently is described talking with her peers and with Teacher AA. For example:

> Student A21 goes over and talks to a boy at a nearby desk. Then she goes to her desk and stands talking with Molly. Next she goes up to the teacher's desk to talk with him. Teacher AA tells her to return to her seat and raise her hand. She does so. When the teacher comes to her desk, Student A21 tells him that she wants a copy of the "word search," an extra credit assignment. . . She and Molly begin working on the word search at Molly's desk.

Student A21's math teacher, Teacher AE, rated her as a markedly different participant than Teacher AA. Teacher AE judged Student A21 to be a dependent/phantom participant. This combination of participation characteristics suggests that Student A21 seldom talked with other students in this class, but at the same time needed frequent help and feedback from others in order to complete her work successfully. Interestingly, the observation narratives indicate that Student A21, in fact, talked with other students. She particularly interacted with rather often with Student A7. However, these conversations may have been conducted in a quiet manner that did not attract the teacher's attention. Further, the narratives provide numerous examples of Student A21 seeking assistance from either the teacher or from Student A7. For instance:

> Teacher AE instructs the students to copy and answer addition and subtraction problems in their workbook and to check their answers by casting out nines. Student A21 copies and solves the problems. She initiates a conversation with Student A7.

The observer also noted that Student A21 compared her progress with Student A7 and erased her answers to make them the same as Student A7's. In addition, the narratives include several instances when Teacher AE provided individual assistance to Student A21, as illustrated in the following excerpt:

> Teacher AE gets a chair so she can sit by Student A21. The teacher says to Student A21,

> "The problem with casting out nines is to make sure your addition is correct. As long as you get all your work done, you're not going to get an 'F'. I'm going to have you redo this and bring it in Monday."

As noted above, no participation characteristic ratings were completed by Student A21's music teacher or the observer in this class. Inasmuch as the case description contains data regarding the class, excerpts from the narratives are provided to illustrate the ways in which she went about completion of the learning tasks assigned by Teacher AG. Generally, her participation in this class can be described as social. It involved interaction with other students for both academic and nonacademic purposes. The following excerpt is representative of this interaction:

> Student A21 is talking to the boy diagonally to her left. Then she reads her book. She breaks off to talk with the girl on her left. She returns to her reading, then looks at the boy on her left again. She reads, runs her hands through her hair, and reads some more. Then she looks at the teacher. She talks with the girl on her left again.

Another example is:

> Student A21 reads the questions to her friends. The student on her left shows her where the answer is in her book. As they talk, they watch the teacher carefully. The teacher has said many times, he does not want the students helping each other. Student A21 erases her paper and writes.

The above overview of Student A21's participation suggests that she frequently interacted with other students to obtain assistance with her work. Hence, although the social aspects of her participation might be seen as predominant, the dependent rating given by her math teacher also seems to be appropriate. Further, in those classes in which the teacher attempted to keep the students' interaction with one another at a minimum, Student A21 nonetheless engaged in surreptitious dialogues with her peers. She did not adjust her behavior to the requirements of these classes except to be somewhat less obvious in her exchanges with other students than she was in classes where the teacher allowed some interaction. Her apparent concern that the teacher not "catch" her talking with other students was noted by the observer in the music class, in particular. Here Student A21 often was described as watching the teacher to be sure he was not looking in her direction.

Student A22. Student A22 's participation characteristics were rated by her seventh-grade math and music teachers and by the

observer in her English class. A common element across all three classes was a rating as a success participant. Thus, Student A22 appears to have attended to academic tasks, completed her work successfully, seldom interrupted the teacher or other students by shouting out answers to questions, generally begun another task when the assigned work was completed, and seldom needed help from the teacher. In the English and music classes, she also was rated as a phantom participant, which would indicate that in addition to the success behaviors, she seldom worked with or initiated conversations with the teacher or other students. Somewhat surprisingly the music teacher also considered Student A22 to be a social participant, a participation category that is almost the opposite of the phantom rating he gave her as well. Excerpts from the case description help to clarify her mode of participation in each of the classes. They begin with the English class.

The observer in Student A22's English class repeatedly used words such as "serious," "quiet," and "attentive" to describe her participation. She rarely was observed talking with anyone. She seldom diverted her attention from the assigned tasks by drawing, doodling, or allowing her eyes to wander around the classroom. She seemed to be able to give the teacher or the assigned tasks her undivided attention. The following excerpt from the case description illustrates this form of behavior:

> During this entire period the students were involved in seatwork. Teacher AE assigned reading work, which included vocabulary words, a story to read, and comprehension questions to answer. Student A22 picked up a dictionary and began working on her vocabulary. She was absorbed in the task. She did not interact with the teacher or with the students who sat around her.

Hence, the success/phantom rating appears to have been an accurate description of Student A22's participation in her English class.

Student A22's participation in her math class corresponded with the success rating given by the teacher. In addition, she was observed to function as a phantom participant. Academically, she attended to her work, rarely interrupting herself. Socially, she appeared to isolate herself from the other students, rarely talking with them. For example:

> Teacher AE began the class by giving an explanation of long division. Student A22 rested her hand on her chin, looking at the teacher and listening to her explanation. The teacher then assigned some division problems. Student A22 began to work on them. After about 15 minutes she put her pencil down and changed her position from one bent

> over her desk and paper, to one slouched in her chair. This seemed to indicate that she was finished with the assignment.

Based on the observations in the music class, it seemed that Student A22 interacted with Teacher AG more than she did her English and math teachers. She also appeared to talk with other students more in this class. Hence, the social rating given by Teacher AG may have been more accurate than the phantom rating. Excerpts from the case description support the social characteristics. For example, the following excerpt illustrates her interaction with other students:

> During the last part of the period, Student A22 worked on a vocabulary assignment. She worked hard, looking for the words and copying the definitions from the dictionary. Once she kicked the underside of the seat of the girl in front of her. Another time, she tapped the girl on the shoulder to get her attention and talk with her.

The next excerpt provides an example of her willingness to talk with Teacher AG:

> The students began the class working on an assignment which focused on reading musical notation. Student A22 sought help from the teacher several times. Once she asked him, "Is this right?"

Thus, given the participation ratings assigned by her math and English teachers and the observer in her music class as well as descriptive data included in her case description, Student A22 appears to have been more task oriented in grade seven than she was in grade six. Further, with the exception of her music class, she seems to have interacted less frequently with the teacher and other students. The extent to which these changes in behavior seem to be related to successful performance in these classes is discussed in the next chapter.

Student A23. A review of Table 2.5 suggests that Student A23's participation differed in the three seventh-grade classrooms in which he was observed. In the English class, he was rated as a social participant. Here his initiation of interaction with others and his voluntary participation in classroom activities were seen as contributing to the progress of the lessons. His history teacher, Teacher AJ, also rated him as exhibiting five of the six social participation characteristics. In addition, she judged Student A23 to be a success student who attended to assigned tasks, worked on his own, and seldom interrupted others by shouting out answers to questions. In contrast, Student A23's behavior in his math class appears to have been disruptive. Teacher AD rated him as an alienate participant who almost never attended to

assigned tasks, frequently disrupted the class by shouting out answers or engaging in other activities that disturbed the teacher and other students, seldom began another task when assigned work was completed, and almost always needed monitoring by the teacher to stay on task. Teacher AD also considered Student A23 to show little motivation to achieve academic success.

Given such diverse participation ratings, it is important to consider whether information in Student A23's case description supports these varied perceptions of his behavior. Examples follow, beginning with the English class.

By the end of the first five weeks of the school year, the observation narratives focusing on Student A23 in his English class indicate that he was exhibiting many of the characteristics of a social student. He was regularly volunteering answers to questions and contributing to the lesson. He also was acting as a peer teacher, socializing during work time, and working with other students on assignments. Since Teacher AA's rule system allowed students to interact with one another as long as this dialogue did not interfer with the completion of their or other students' work, such participation was acceptable. The following excerpt from the observation narratives suggests that Student A23's behavior met this criterion:

> Student A23 talks briefly with Emily. He's helping her with her word search. Anna, in front of him, turns around and talks to him. Two boys come over and talk with Student A23.
>
> The boys leave and Student A23 continues working on his word search puzzle. He says, "I found a dare-devil," and turns to Emily to show her.
>
> This pattern of working, helping others, and socializing continued until the end of the period.

In his history class, the observation narratives suggest that Student A23 began the school year working independently and completing his work even though he talked with other students. However, by November, Student A23 is described as being noisy and disruptive even though he was still academically oriented. For example, the following comments were made by the observer during the third week of school:

> Student A23 set to work on the assignment. When he finished, he went to the teacher's desk to submit it. He lingered to talk to other students who also were there. Then, Student A23 took a copy of tomorrow's homework and returned to his desk to work on it.

In November, the narratives contained statements of the following nature:

> While Student A23 is still attending to the assigned task, he has been talking almost non-stop for the entire period. [This has occurred] even though the students he talks to are engaged in their work.

In his math class, Student A23's alienate behavior began to be apparent early in the school year. For example consider this excerpt from an observation conducted during the third week of school:

> Student A23 calls to a student outside the room in a loud voice. He takes his paper and shows it to the boys across the aisle. On his return to his seat, he goes to the drinking fountain, talking to students in the rows as he goes.

A week later the observer stated:

> . . . [Student A23 is] tapping his feet loudly on the floor to start a disturbance. [It is] quickly picked up by the rest of the class.

In November, the following comments were made:

> He talks to the girl in front of him and then to the boy behind another girl. He laughs and then whistles. He does some work, then turns around and talks again. He is conveying messages back and forth between the boy and the girl.

When asked about his behavior in the math class, Student A23 indicated that the teacher did not attempt to teach. He said, "He just stands in the back of the room. . . He never answers people for their questions." Apparently, Student A23 rebelled against Teacher AD's unwillingness to control the students and provide help to them by purposefully disrupting this class. Such was not the case in the other classes. There he adhered to the academic and behavioral norms established by the teachers, although he managed to engage in frequent interactions with others at the same time.

Based on the above excerpts and the more complete data contained in his case description, it appears that Student A23's participation took contrasting forms in the three seventh-grade classes in which he was observed. In Teacher AJ's history class, the data indicate that he was a success student with respect to his participation during the month of September. However, in November a distruptive trend in his behavior was observed. In Teacher AA's English class, Student A23 worked and socialized regularly, but stayed within the bounds of acceptable behavior. In

Teacher AD's class, Student A23 exhibited many alienated behaviors. Thus, the data suggest that Student A23 adhered, more or less, to the academic and behavioral norms in classrooms where the teachers fulfilled his expectations for "good" teaching. Teacher AD did not meet Student A23's standards for such teaching and, hence, was not respected or obeyed.

Student A24. Student A24 was observed in his seventh-grade English, history, and math classes. At the end of the first quarter of seventh grade, his English teacher rated his as a success/multitask student. His history teacher gave him a phantom rating. The observer in the math class also rated him as a phantom. Teacher AD did not rate his students.) Thus, one could expect Student A24 to be a quiet person, who did well in class and seldom interacted with others or participated in class discussions. Excerpts from his case description confirm this type of participation.

As reported in the observation narratives, Student A24's behavior in his English class supported a success rating. However, he also was observed initiating interactions with his peers. For example:

> Student A24 is looking in his dictionary to check the meanings of a pair of homonyms. He teases the girl sitting in front of him, saying, "Do they call you 'Dizzy'?"

On another day:

> Teacher AC led the class in a recitation about sentences and sentence fragments and about subjects and predicates. When called upon, Student A24 responded confidently and correctly. While the teacher was explaining the homework assignment, Student A24 corrected a mistake in the explanation. The teacher thanked him. A moment later a neighbor asked Student A24 what they were supposed to do and Student A24 answered. Although the assignment was described as homework, Student A24 finished the work before the period was over and went to the teacher's desk to show it to him.

Student A24's participation in his history class was consistent with the phantom rating given by his teacher. He rarely volunteered to answer questions and was seldom observed initiating interaction with the teacher or with his peers. He typically did not talk with other students and sometimes ignored their overtures. It appeared that Teacher AG's more restrictive rules and behavior-control system prevented Student A24 from engaging in the interactions observed in the English class. The following excerpts illustrate his participation in this class.

> When the teacher asked the class questions about the day's reading assignment, Student A24 listened, but did not volunteer answers. After the discussion was finished, Teacher AG distributed an assignment. It was a word puzzle related to the caveman topic. Student A24 set right to work on the puzzle. Once the boy in front of him turned to ask a question. Student A24 answered but did not look up from his work.

Much later in the year, a similar form of behavior continued to be observed:

> Teacher AG lectured the class on the social organization of the Roman Empire. Student A24 listened and played with his watch. Unlike the other studetns who raised their hands to respond to questions, Student A24 sat quietly. Toward the end of the period, Teacher AG distributed a homework assignment and explained it to the students. Student A24 immediately began working on it.

In math, Student A24's participation changed as the year progressed. During the early part of September, he attended to his assignments and eargerly volunteered to answer questions. He rarely interacted with other students. By the end of September, and again in November, he was talking with other students and displayed much off-task behavior. In part, this shift in participation may have been due to Teacher AD's failure to maintain classroom order and discipline. The following excerpt illustrates his beginning of the year behavior:

> Teacher AD is explaining sets and subsets. Student A24 has his hand in the air to provide the solution for each problem. He follows in the book. Although many of the students in the room are talking with each other, Student A24 does not talk to them.

An excerpt from one of the November observations describes the changes that occurred:

> Student A24 looks back and talks with the boy behind him. He upsets his books onto the floor, gets up and picks them up. (He did this to create a diversion; actually the books were more or less pushed off his desk.) Teacher AD says that the class should get ready to correct papers. Student A24 continues talking with the boy behind him. Neither he nor the boy has a paper to correct.

The case description for Student A24 suggests that in classes that were organized around teacher-directed recitations and required well-ordered student behavior, Student A24 generally remained on-task and completed his work successfully. In Teacher AD's class where the behavioral norms were essentially established by the students, and lack of attention to tasks was not sanctioned by the teacher, Student A24 was increasingly off-task as the year progressed. It is interesting to note the observer's phantom participation rating in this class, given the shift in Student A24's behavior. It must be remembered, that Teacher AD's classes generally were chaotic with high levels of noise and confusion. Even though his behavior in this class was more social than in other classes, Student A24's participation may have appeared to be at a phantom level compared with that of the other students.

Summary. The four target students who were rated as social participants by their sixth-grade teachers exhibited a variety of participation characteristics in their various seventh-grade classes. For the most part, the strictness of the teacher's rule system seemed to influence the extent to which these students interacted with their peers and the teacher. Generally, the students adapted their behavior to the requirements of each particular rule system. Because of the nature of the classroom, the behavior of both Students A23 and A24 in Teacher AD's class should be considered as an exception to the participation characteristics of this group of target students. Perhaps due to the chaotic nature of Teacher AD's classes, the students did not appear to worry about how well they did in this class. In fact, their participation became less productive as the year progressed. This was not the case for the other classes. Although all four students began talking with other students more as they became acquainted with the rules in their classes and knew how much interaction was acceptable, they also stayed within the bounds of approved participation and completed the assigned work.

Students Rated as Success/Multitask Participants in Grade Six

Target Students A25, A26, A27, and A28 were rated as success/multitask participants by their sixth-grade teachers. Students whose classroom behavior falls within this participation category almost always attend to academic tasks and almost never require academic help to complete the tasks that are assigned. They also begin another academic task as soon as the assigned task is completed. They seldom interrupt the teacher or others by shouting out answers to the teacher's questions. They prefer to work alone and frequently work on more than one task or activity at the same time. Table 2.6 reports the participation ratings given by the teachers (or observers) in the seventh-grade classes in which the students were observed. Descriptions follow of the ways each of these four students participated in the classes based on data contained in their case descriptions.

Table 2.6

Seventh Grade Participation Categories
of Target Students Rated as
Success/Multitask Participants in Sixth Grade

TARGET STUDENT	CLASSROOM PARTICIPATION RATING										
	Sixth Grade	Seventh-Grade Classes in Which Observed									
		AA	AB	AC	AD	AE	AF	AG	AH	AI	AJ	AK
A25 Male	Success			Alienate	Social/ Phantom*			Success				
A26 Male	Success	Social				Social*						Social
A27 Female	Success	Social		Social							Success	
A28 Female	Success	Success/ Phantom	Success/ Phantom*		Phantom*							

* This rating was given by the observer. No teacher rating was available for this class.

Student A25. Student A25 was observed in his math, history, and English classes noted in Table 2.6, his participation patterns differed in these three classes. Teacher AD, the math teacher to whom Student A25 was assigned, did not rate Student A25's participation characteristics. Base on the observer rating, Student A25's behavior in this class appears to have been difficult to categorize, since the observer did not rate him as evidencing five of the six characteristics for any participation category at an ideal or typical level. The two categories in which four of the characteristics were rated at one of these levels were social and phantom. This particular combination of characteristics is somewhat suprising inasmuch as a social student's participation emphasizes interaction with others and a phantom's stresses little, if any, interaction. Interestingly, the excerpts from the observation narratives that are included in Student A25's case description, suggest that in this particular classroom, he was on-task some of the time, idle on other occasions, and socialized with other students during some observations. His socialization appeared to increase as the year progressed. However, he nonetheless continued to produce complete and accurate work throughout the first quarter of the school year. The following case description excerpt illustrates the way in which he combined such on-task and social behavior:

> Student A25 is looking at the two boys across the aisle. They are carrying on a conversation. He joins the conversation and talks to them. He returns to work for a short time and then resumes the conversation with the two boys and with a girl. He returns to his paper and continues to work on it until the end of the observation.

Another excerpt provides an example of the type of behavior that may have led to the observer's phantom rating:

> Student A25 sits studying the guide and then begins working on the problems given to the class for homework. He stops as the teacher starts a discussion. He is following the content of the discussion in his textbook, then goes back to work on his homework. He continues to work after the bell has rung.

Student A25's history teacher decribed him as "serious," "works hard," and "listens intently," all of which match the success/multitask rating he was given in this class. Two excerpts from the case description illustrate this behavior. The first is taken from an observation that occurred early in the school year:

> Teacher AG began the day having students read aloud from the textbook. As various students read, Student A25 alternated between following in the text and fiddling nervously with his pen. Throughout the oral reading, the teacher asked the students questions based on the content of what was read. Student A25 only responded to these questions near the end of the discussion. Following the discussion, the teacher distributed an assignment and discussed it with the students. Teacher AG told the students to begin working. Student A25 did so.

In November, Student A25's participation was described as follows:

> Teacher AG instructed the students to write an obituary for Octavian. While he was writing, Student A25 raised his hand to ask the teacher a question. [Note: This was the first time Student A25 had been observed requesting assistance across all the observations.] When he finished the writing, Student A25 worked quietly on another assignment.

Teacher AC rated Student A25 as an alienate participant in his English class. In describing Student A25, Teacher AC emphasized the social aspects of his behavior and inidicated that he needed to work on his study skills and his acceptance of responsibility.

In the observation narratives, the social aspects of Student A25's participation were highlighted more than the disruptive alienate characteristics. For example, the following comments from Student A25's case description are indicative of social participation. They are made in reference to his behavior in the English class early in September:

> Twice during the period Student A25 was observed socializing with his neighbors. He also was observed responding to the teachers questions.

On other occasions, this same sort of behavior became disruptive in nature:

> Teacher AC is reading the answers to the homework assignment to the class.
> Student A25 asks, "Is 8 out of 12 good?"
> Teacher AC answers, "No."
> Student A25 says, "Oh, oh, oh, oh!"
> Teacher AC asks the students to raise their hands if they are satisfied with what they did.
> Student A25 raises his hand and says without being called on, "I forgot to circle Laura Belle."

Looking across the three calsses in which student A25 was observed, his behavior in the history class suggests that they way in which the teacher controlled students' mobility and interaction with others influenced the extent to which Student A25 remained on-task. In less firmly structured classes, Student A25 was more social and less task focused.

Student A26. Student A26 was observed in Teacher AA's English class, Teacher AE's math class, and Teacher AK's home economics class. As reported in Table 2.6, Student A26 was, by and large, judged to be a social participant. Thus, he appears to have initiated interactions with others, worked with others, and volunteered to answer the teachers' questions more frequently in seventh grade than in sixth. Excerpts from Student A26's case description provide further information regarding his participation in seventh grade.

In his English class, Student A26 established friendships with the students near him, but did not let the social exhanges he had with these students interfere with his school work. For example, early in the year, the observer made the following comments:

> Student A26 finishes a page, and tears it off. He stretches. He looks around, swinging his foot. He plays with a sheet of paper. He talks with Theresa, asking her something, then he opens his folder, turns his book to the story, and starts to read.

Later, in November, the following excerpt was contained in the observation narratives:

> The teacher is beginning to read. He asks if anyone can summarize the stories that follow.

Student A26 volunteers and is called upon. He answers briefly.

The teacher then asks a number of other questions.

Student A26 puts up his hand, but is not called on. He sits listening to the teacher talking with other students. He has his textbook open. His assignment sheet and binder are ready on his desk.

The teacher starts to read.

Student A26 opens his binder and begins writing. Then he begins to read in his textbook. He is swinging his legs as he sits, following the teacher's reading. He leans back, holding the book.

The teacher asks a question.

Student A26 raises his hand, but is not called upon.

The teacher asks, "What things are easy for the tiger to catch?"

Student A26 replies without being called on, "People."

Teacher AE acknowledges that this is a correct answer.

Student A26's participation in his math class was similar to that in his English class. He completed his work but he also interacted frequently with other students. In addition, in this class, he sought help from the teacher. The following excerpt from his case description illustrates this form of behavior:

> Student A26 raises his left hand and waits for Teacher AE, who is sitting at her desk, looking down. He wiggles in his chair. His hand has now been up for about a minute. He pokes a girl sitting in front of him, who also has her hand up. He rubs his eyes with his other hand...It looks as though he is continuing to do his work. Finally, the teacher gets to Student A26's desk. Their conversation is inaudible.

As the year progressed, Teacher AE began to reprimand Student A26 for talking. For example:

> There is alot of noise coming from the window side of the room. Teacher AE says, "Student A26, I would hate to send you out again today."

In his home economics class, Student A26 seemed to apply himself during the nutrition seatwork assignments but did not appear to be serious about the cooking aspects of the class. During the cooking periods, his social behavior was very evident. The following excerpt provides an example of his participation in a seatwork assignment:

Student A26 looks on as the teacher answers the questions of a boy sitting nearby. He listens and apparently gets the answer to his question. He turns and starts to work again. He works for a minute or so and then puts his hand up again. He waves his hand. His hand shoots up vigorously trying to get the teacher's attention.

Teacher AK looks over and sees it and says, "I'm getting there. Hold on."

Teacher AK gets to Student A26 and answers his question. Then she turns and talks with another student.

Student A26 smiles and goes back to work.

In the cooking group, Student A26 participated as follows:

Student A26 is in his unit with five girls. He says to the girls, "You guys, wash your hands." He washes his hands and says, "My hands are squeaking clean..."

Student A26 gets the garbage can and says in a mock French accent, "Here's our garbage."

The girl with the batter tells the others, "You guys, don't eat the batter when its raw."

Student A26 says, "Yeah, it will make you very sick."

The students in the group begin to argue. Student A26 calls one of the girls "Julia Child".

Their conversation continues in the same vein until the end of the period.

In each of the classes discussed here, Student A26 manifested the ability to remain on task when there was work to be done and to socialize when the work was completed or he was waiting for help from the teacher. He appeared to be confident and at ease when initiating interactions with his teachers or his peers, which he did frequently. Further, although his participation definitely can be described as social, he continued to function as a success student during those times when he was concentrating on his work. The above excerpt from the English class observation narratives which describes Student A26 as both following the teacher as he reads and doing the day's a assignment, is an example of his success/multitask characteristics.

Student A27. In order to accommodate her desire to take a foreign language and to move to a more difficult mathematics class, Student A27 changed classes several times during the first three weeks of seventh grade. As a result, the observation data regarding her participation in seventh-grade are less extensive

than those available for the other target students. The information reported here is for the final two classes in which she was observed. These were her history class and her English class.

Student A27's history teacher rated her as a success/multitask participant (see Table 2.6). Her English teacher indicated that she was a social participant. Examples from the case description illustrate the ways in which she was observed to behave in these classes.

Student A27's behavior in the English class suggested that the assignments were easy for her. She seemed to be able to complete the assigned work and also devote a considerable amount of time to social interactions, thereby warranting the social rating given by the teacher. For example:

> Student A27 turns the pages in her book until she reaches the story the teacher is about to read. She puts her feet up on the chair in front of her, Darcy's chair. Darcy seems irritated about this. Student A27 ignores Darcy and starts following the point in the book where the teacher is reading.
>
> Student A27 turns around and calls Elizabeth's attention to Darcy's irritation and laughs. The boy in front of Elizabeth stands up. Student A27 encourages Elizabeth to kick this boy as she is kicking Darcy.

Other comments in the case description further exemplify her participation in this class. Among them are

> While the teacher explains the lesson, Student A27 quietly follows his directions and listens to his presentation of the material. When the students begin to do the exercises, Student A27 interacts with the teacher and her peers.

In her history class, Student A27 was both a success/multitask and a social participant, as rated by the teacher. Again, the work that was assigned seemed to allow Student A27 to engage in numerous social interactions and at the sametime complete not only the assignments but the extra credit work required to earn an "A" grade in the class, as well. For example:

> Student A27 and another girl are sitting facing each other, their desks pulled together. They have their assignment sheets open in front of them. They appear to be having a conversation interspersed with work.
>
> Student A27 turns and calls to a girl behind her, "Emma, Emma!"

Emma does not answer.

Student A27 then says to the girl with whom she is working, "Oh, that was Octavia." This is the answer to a question on the assignment.

The girl reads another question to Student A27. They discuss it. Student A27 turns in her seat and talks with the boy behind her.

Comments in Student A27's case description also indicate that in this class she was an attentive and active participant in class recitations. Teacher AJ stated that she was conscientious about her work. The observer noted that she juggled her work and conversations with a half-dozen students in a manner that resulted in fewer sanctions by the teacher than might have been expected given the rigidity of Teacher AJ's rule system.

Hence, Student A27 appears to have continued her success/multi task behaviors and at the sametime added a regular pattern of social interaction to her mode of participation in her seventh-grade classes.

Student A28. Student A28 was observed in her math, history, and English classes. Based on the rating given by her English teacher and the observer ratings in the math and history classes, she clearly was judged to be a quiet phantom participant who almost never volunteered to answer the teacher's questions, seldom initiated interactions with others, and seldom participated actively in classroom lessons. She also was rated as a success/multitask student in two of the classes -- English and history (see Table 2.6).

Persual of Student A28's case description suggests that initially her behavior in her math class matched the phantom rating given by the observer. She began the year as a quiet, on-task student, then moved to frequent interactions with students who sat near her. It is noteworthy that many of these contacts seemed to be for the purpose of obtaining help with her work. The following case description excerpt illustrates her on-task behavior:

After the discussion was over, Teacher AD distributed a sheet of long division problems. Student A28 worked quietly at her desk, swinging her feet back and forth. As she worked, she occasionally talked with Student A13 who sat across from her. She continued working on the division problems until the end of the period.

Later in the year, the observer described her participation as follows:

Student A28 turns around and talks to Student A25 who explains a problem to her. Then Student A25 turns around and asks the

> student behind him how to do the problem. He turns back to Student A28 and talks with her. She goes back to work. Then she asks Student A25 for help again. She talks to Student A13.

The observer in the history class described Student A28 as "very serious and very isolated." The case description indicates that she rarely initiated interaction with other students or the teacher and she rarely volunteered to participate in a recitation. However, she did listen attentively to the teacher and other students during the recitations and worked consistently at assigned tasks. For example:

> Teacher AB conducted a recitation based on the oral reading the class had just completed. She asked students to volunteer to participate, promising extra credit if they did so. Student A28 listened and appeared to be very serious. She did not volunteer, in spite of the teacher's contining efforts to encourage nonvolunteers to do so.

On another day:

> Teacher AB distributed a replica of Hammurabi's code of laws, written in cuneiform. The students were very interested and enthusiastic. However, Student A28 did not appear to share this enthusiasm. She was very quiet and did not talk out.

In English, Student A28 also began the year working quietly, not interacting with her peers. However, in this class she occasionally volunteered to answer the teacher's questions and by mid-November, her participation in this class had changed considerably. The observer noted that by that time she was arranging her work around opportunities to socialize with her friends. Since she continued completing the assigned tasks successfully, the success/multitask rating appears to be a more appropriate description of her participation in this class than the phantom rating. The following excerpt provides an example of her behavior early in the year:

> Teacher AA explained to Student A28 and her reading group that the task for the day was to finish the assignment they had been given at the beginning of the week. Student A28 worked quietly on her questions, finishing them 20 minutes before the end of the period. For the remainder of the period, she sat at her desk looking around the room, playing with her hair, and looking through her possessions. She did not do additional work or talk with any of her classmates.

In contrast, in November the following behavior occurred:

> Student A28 took her assignment sheet, turned to the assigned story in the textbook, and worked on the questions that accompanied it. After a few minutes, she got up from her seat and went to the teacher's desk to staple her work together. She talked briefly with the teacher, then returned to her desk. She left her desk and went over to join her friend Jane, who was talking with another girl. The three girls talked about their report cards.

Based on the data in her case descripton, Student A28 seems to have continued the success/ multitask mode of participation in grade seven. Most often, she was quiet and workoriented. However, in the seventh-grade English class where the rule system allowed students to interact so long as they did not prevent other students from completing their work, Student A28 became more social as the year progressed. Similar changes in her participation occurred in the math class in which Teacher AD made few demands on students and seldom sanctioned them for talking or other types of disruptive behavior. Regardless, she seemed to complete the assigned work in a successful manner.

Summary. The four students rated as success/multitask participants in grade six exhibited a variety of participation characteristics in grade seven. In classes where the rule system provided opportunities for students to interact, most of these students became more social as the year progressed. In classes where the rule system allowed little interaction, some, particularly Student A27 but also Student A26 to some extent, developed strategies for carrying on conversations in ways that did not result in sanctioning by the teacher. Regardless, all of them seemed to complete their work successfully, an outcome that would suggest that they continued to be success students, while adding the social characteristics in grade seven. Perhaps the low level, fill-in-the-blank nature of the assignments in the classes at Waverley afforded them greater opportunity to function as both success and social students than the assignments given in their sixth-grade classes.

Conclusion

The above descriptions of the target students' participation in their seventh-grade classes suggest several conclusions.

First, most of the students appear to have evidenced participation characteristics in grade seven that were similar to those they were rated as exhibiting in grade six. This was the case for more students than not, and often when a different rating was given

for a student's participation in a seventh-grade class, the observation narratives excerpted in the student's case description suggested that the student continued to show many of the previous characteristics while, at the sametime, assuming new ways of participating. Hence, by the end of grade six, these students seem to have developed ways of participating in instruction that were stable enough to reappear in a variety of seventh-grade classrooms.

Second, the students who seemed to show the greatest variation in their participation characteristics across the seventh-grade classes in which they were observed were those who were rated as dependent participants in grade six. These students seemed to be affected by the type of rule system the teacher established more than other students. In classrooms where the teacher allowed little, or no, interaction among students, these target students often became phantom participants. In other settings, some of these students exhibited social participation characteristics and some success characteristics. However, all continued to need frequent help and feedback from the teacher or others to complete their work successfully. For this reason, their tendency to move to phantom participation in certain settings is a matter of concern. It seems reasonable to assume that quiet students who do not interact with the teacher or other students will not receive the sort of assistance and support these students need in order to remain on-task and progress in their work. Their social behavior also maybe explained in terms of their requirements as dependent participants. Several students engaged in frequent conversations with their peers in order to obtain the help and feedback they needed.

Third, although the target students who were rated as social participants in grade six generally continued to exhibit social characteristics, several of them also were rated as success participants in grade seven. Thus, at Waverley, these students seemed to be able to complete their work successfully and interact frequently with other students as well. This also was the case for several of the students rated as success participants in grade six. The success students began the year as quiet, on-task participants, then increased in the amount of time they spent interacting with other students as they learned how to do so without attracting sanctions from the teacher and as they began to complete their work early in the class period. These participation patterns suggest that the difficulty of the learning tasks assigned to students as well as the rules for interaction established by the teacher may influence the ways in which some students participate in classroom activities. As noted earlier, for the most part the assignments given to students at Waverley were fact-recall, fill-in-the-blank in nature. Apparently both social and success participants in grade six were able to socialize and complete their work successfully in grade seven.

Fourth, the students who seemed to show the least tendency to modify their pattern of participation in grade seven were those who were rated as alienate participants in grade six. Three of

the four target students in this group received alienate ratings in most of their seventh-grade classes. They appeared to enter their classes at Waverley ready to confront the teacher and others. However, one student, Student A6, seemed to break this pattern. He was rated as a phantom participant in all three of the classes in which he was observed. The observation data reported in his case description support the phantom ratings. Since the change in Student A6's participation occurred in three classes with markedly different rule systems and with teachers who interacted with students in different ways, it appears that whatever produced this change by the time he entered Waverley, Student A6 no longer was confronting the system, the teachers, or other students. His move to phantom participation also is worth noting in that it represents the participation category with behaviors that present the least challenge to the classroom system. Student A6 seems to have made extensive modifications in his behavior.

Fifth, as was noted in the discussion of target student selection at the beginning of the chapter, the teachers rated very few students as isolate participants in grade six. Similarly, the seventh-grade teachers seldom assigned these characteristics to a student. Across, all the classrooms in which the 24 target students were observed, only four isolate ratings were given. This raises an interesting issue. Perhaps teachers are not aware of the extent to which they and the students are isolating some students. The characteristics that are descriptive of an isolate participant are ones that suggest the teacher may pay so little attention to this student that it would be possible to overlook the difficult and unpleasant situation in which the student may be placed. If this is the case, teachers may need to have such students pointed out to them by an independent observer in order to increase the likelihood that teacher-student interaction will be modified to bring about more successful participation in instructional activities for these students.

Finally, the participation characteristics developed by Ward, et al., based on observations in elementary school classrooms proved to be useful descriptors of students' participation in junior high school classrooms as well. It was possible to code the participation of all the target students in all the seventh-grade classes in which they were observed using the categories and the characteristics from the original framework. One difference in the ratings that occurred in grade seven was the assignment of more than one participation category as descriptive of a student's behavior in a particular class. This most likely was the result of the changes in the coding procedures used in grade seven compared with grade six. In grade seven, the teachers were given a 21-item observation checklist and asked to rate the extent to which each item described a student's participation. In grade six, the teachers were given definitions of each participation category and asked to state which category best described the student's participation. Thus, the ratings on the 21-item checklist could produce characteristics from more than one category while the sixth-grade raratings could not. Another possible explanation for the applicability of

multiple categories in grade seven was the number of classes in which the rigid rule system established by the teacher allowed little, if any, interaction among the classroom members. In these instances, to be successful, a student usually had to be a phantom participant first, and then show other characteristics such as those of a success/multitask participant. The opportunity for students to socialize and also complete assignments successfully, which was mentioned above, likewise may have resulted in multiple categories being appropriate descriptors of students' particiation.

The next chapter of this report presents information regarding the target students' success in their transition to junior high school. The discussion interrelates the information reported here regarding the students' participation characteristics with the within-activity structure features of the classroom and the students' success in moving to effective performance in the junior high school setting, based on the four criteria outlined in Chapter One.

CHAPTER THREE

TARGET STUDENTS' SUCCESS IN TRANSITION TO JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL

Chapter One discussed the developmental changes that students undergo between ages 10 and 14 and indicated that provision of an effective learning program for these students requires attention to several aspects of the students' performance in school. As the case descriptions for the target students were compiled, it became apparent that, indeed, the seventh-grade students whom we were studying differed in their levels of development and their responses to the junior high school setting. Further, it was obvious that junior high school included a wide variety of experiences. Each student at Waverley had six classes per day (a few had seven). All students moved from classroom to classroom five or six times a day, which required movement through the hallways of the school. This, in turn, entailed contact with large numbers of other students and some teachers, many of whom were unknown to the target students prior to entry into junior high school. All students interacted to some extent with the teacher and other students in the classrooms to which they were assigned. Most students socialized with at least a small group of peers (friends) before, during, and after school. Some students had experiences on the way from home to school and return that seemed to influence their in-school performance.

Based on these observations as well as the writings of several experts in the field of adolescent education (which were referenced in Chapter One), the four criteria that were proposed earlier for judging the success of the target students' transitions to junior high school appear to be appropriate. These are:

- Academic achievement. Academic achievement may be measured using a students' performance on standardized achievement tests, or on criterion-referenced tests. Grades earned by a student also may be used so long as the possible variations in the performance criteria imposed by various teachers in awarding a specific grade are kept in mind.

- Involvement in academic tasks. The amount of class time a student is engaged in academic vs. nonacademic tasks serves as a short-term measure of performance. The completeness and correctness of the written work the student does and the appropriateness, completeness, and correctness of a student's oral responses (or lack of response)

to the teacher's oral questions during recitation also may be considered.

- Response to rules and norms. In most junior high/middle school classrooms, norms and rules are established relative to interaction with others, movement about the classroom, initiation of contacts with the teachers, and so forth. Procedures for format and submission of work and work schedules also are set up. The extent to which a student's behavior suggests (s)he understands and is responding appropriately to these requirements in a particular class serves as a measure of successful participation in that setting. The school also may impose rules and norms. A student's understanding of and response to these may be considered as well.

- Relationships with others. The extent to which a student establishes relationships with others that, at a minimum, are not hostile provides a crude but interpretable measure of the student's accomplishments relative to peer and adult relations.

Chapter Two reported findings regarding the target students' participation in classroom activities. This chapter looks at the success of the students' transitions to junior high school based on the four criteria listed above. The ratings for each student were obtained by having two independent raters read the student's case description and, based on a summary impression of the student's performance, rate the student as successful, moderately successful, or unsucessful relative to one of the four criteria. The rater cycled through the case description four times, once for each criterion, focusing on the specific aspects of the student's performance that were most relevant to the criterion being rated. Once a student's ratings for the four individual criteria were completed, the rater was asked to give the student a "total" success in transition score. The same three rating categories were used. In arriving at this score, the rater was to apply his or her overall judgments about the student's transition, rather than build a score based on a summing of the four criteria. The intent was to obtain a general impression of the success of the student's experience. Thus a student might be given a success rating as a total score even though one or more of the four criteria had been rated at a moderately successful or unsuccessful level. In those few instances where the two raters disagreed, a third independent rater completed the same analyses and ratings. The majority rating was used as the student's score.

The discussion that follows presents the transition success data for the target students. It first looks at transition success from the standpoint of the participation category to which the students were assigned by their sixth-grade teacher. We chose to present the

findings in this manner in order to highlight any performance patterns that might occur within a group of students who appeared to have behaved in similar ways in their sixth-grade classrooms. After looking at the ratings in this manner, we will explore the relationships that exist, if any, between the students' participation characteristics in grade seven and the success of their transitions. In both these discussions, we will consider the extent to which the presence of the four instructional features that were found to differentiate among the seventh-grade classes appears to be related to the success of students with various participation characteristics.

Student Success in Transition to Junior High School Based on Participation Characteristics in Grade Six

As outlined in Chapter Two, the 24 target students whose transitions to junior high school were studied in depth were selected to include four students who were rated by their sixth-grade teachers to be alienate participants in grade six, four who were rated as phantom participants, eight who were rated as dependent participants, four who were rated as social participants, and four who were rated as success/multitask participants. Detailed information regarding the participation characteristics associated with these ratings also was provided in Chapter Two. The presentation of findings regarding these students' success in transition into the education program at Waverley begins with the students who were rated as aliente participants.

Success of Students Rated as Alienate Participants in Grade Six

Students A5, A6, A7, and A8 were rated as alienate participants in grade six. Further, as reported in Chapter Two, with the exception of Student A6, they continued to exhibit alienate participation characteristics in grade seven. Hence, for the most part, these students could be described as purposefully confronting the teacher and other students and requiring frequent monitoring by the teacher in order to attend to assign tasks. Student A6 differed from this pattern in his junior high school classes. He was rated as a phantom participant by the teachers in all three seventh-grade classes in which he was observed. This suggests that he was a quiet student who completed his work with minimal interaction with the teacher or other students.

Table 3.1 presents the transition success ratings for these four students. Relative to the grade earned for the fall quarter of seventh grade, which provides some insight into a student's academic success in the classes in which (s)he was observed, Student A5 showed a mixed pattern of performance. He received "B-" grades in his reading skills and home economics classes, which are indicative of successful academic transition. However, in the English

Table 3.1

Transition Success of Target Students Rated as Alienated Participants in Grade Six

TARGET STUDENT	TRANSITION CRITERION	TEACHER								
		AA	AB	AD	AE	AF	AG	AH	AJ	AK
A5 Male	Fall Quarter Grade	F (English)		(D) Math				B- (Reading)		B- (Home Economics)
	Academic Behavior	unsuccessful		unsuccessful				unsuccessful		successful
	Adaptation to Rules and Norms	unsuccessful		unsuccessful				moderately successful		moderately successful
	Peer Relations	successful		unsuccessful				successful		successful
	TOTAL	unsuccessful		unsuccessful				successful		successful
A6 Male	Fall Quarter Grade		C- (English)	B (Math)						C+ (Home Economics)
	Academic Behavior		unsuccessful	successful						successful
	Adaptation to Rules and Norms		successful	successful						successful
	Peer Relations		unsuccessful	successful						successful
	TOTAL		moderately successful	successful						successful
A7 Female	Fall Quarter Grade				C (Math)		F (History)			
	Academic Behavior				moderately successful		moderately successful			
	Adaptation to Rules and Norms				unsuccessful		successful			
	Peer Relations				successful		unsuccessful			
	TOTAL				moderately successful		unsuccessful			
A8 Female	Fall Quarter Grade				C (Math)	B- (Art)		F (Reading)	F (History)	
	Academic Behavior				unsuccessful	unsuccessful		unsuccessful	unsuccessful	
	Adaptation to Rules and Norms				unsuccessful	unsuccessful		unsuccessful	unsuccessful	
	Peer Relations				unsuccessful	unsuccessful		unsuccessful	moderately successful	
	TOTAL				unsuccessful	moderately successful		unsuccessful	unsuccessful	

grades suggest that he was unsuccessful academically. Student A6, who is the one student who changed his participation characteristics to those of a phantom in grade seven, was successful in math ("B") and moderately successful in the other two classes in which he was observed ("C-" in English and "C+" in home economics). Student A7 was moderately successful in math ("C") and unsuccessful in history ("F"). Student A8 was successful in art ("B-"), moderately successful in math ("C"), and unsuccessful in reading skills ("F") and history ("F").

Taken as a single measure of transition success, the grades-earned performance of these students at first glance seems to offer a varied and uninterpretable pattern. However, if Student A6 is removed from the set of students, the remaining students earned higher grades in classes that were less academic, such as art and home economics. The students who were assigned to Teacher AE also were moderately successful in math, but Student A5, who was in one of Teacher AD's math classes where little, if any, teacher control and management of instruction occurred, received a "D" grade, which indicated unsuccessful performance. History and English generally proved to be difficult for these students.

The academic behavior criteria provide another measure of the extent to which these students participated successfully in classroom instruction. Perusal of Table 3.1 indicates that, even with Student A6 included in the group, the ratio of successful to unsuccessful academic behavior is heavily on the unsuccessful side; 8 unsuccessful ratings to 5 successful or moderately successful ratings. Such ratings are consistent with what one would expect to find in a group of students described as alienate participants by their teachers. Lack of attention to assigned tasks and disruption of other students are typical forms of behavior for such students.

Referring back to information presented in Chapter Two, it is interesting to note that of the five successful or moderately successful academic behavior ratings that were given across all the classes in which these four target students were observed, three occurred in classes where the students were not rated as exhibiting alienate characteristics. Student A7 is the exception to this pattern.

The ratings given for adaptation to classroom rules and norms indicate that the students adapted successfully in about half the classes (7) and unsuccessfully in the others (6). Student A8 was unsuccessful in all the classes in which she was observed. Student A6 was successful in the three classes in which he was observed. The other two students' success varied across the classes in which they were observed. No particular explanation for this variance was obvious.

Somewhat surprisingly, these students also were successful in their relations with their peers in approximately half the classes in which they were observed. Again, a 7 to 6 successful classes

in which they were observed. Again, a 7 to 6 successful or moderately successful vs. unsuccessful distribution occurred. Each of the target students was unsuccessful in his or her peer relations in at least one classroom. Student A8 made the least successful social transition. She received unsuccessful ratings in three classes and a moderately successful rating in the fourth. Looking at the students individually, Student A5 established successful peer relations in classrooms where the teachers' rules systems allowed some interaction among students as long as their talking did not disturb students who were working. He received an unsuccessful rating in a classroom where little, if any, control was exerted over student interaction. Apparently, he took advantage of this situation to create negative interactions with the other students. Both Students A6 and A7 were unsuccessful in relations with their peers in classrooms where the teacher established a rigid rule system that allowed no student interaction. In contrast, the only classroom in which Student A8 was successful was one in which such a rigid system was in place. She seemed to need such control in order to avoid conflicts with her peers. Hence, across the four students, there does not appear to be a common relationship between the rule system of the classroom and students' success in building positive peer relations.

Overall, the raters judged the students' transitions to be more unsuccessful than successful. Removing Student A6 from the group, since he did not continue to participate as an alienate in grade seven, the other three students were given successful or moderately successful total transition ratings in four classes and unsuccessful ones in six. Three of the five unsuccessful ratings were given to Student A8. Student A5 was unsuccessful in two of the four classes in which he was observed; Student A7 in one of the two in which she was observed. Relating the students ratings to the instructional features that differentiated among the seventh-grade classrooms, whether the teacher utilized the four features in the classroom did not appear to result in more success for the students. What did appear to matter was the same aspect of the classroom that was relevant for the letter grade earned by the student. This was whether the class was an academic subject to which students had been assigned heterogeneously. With only one exception, Student A7's performance in Teacher AE's math class, the students were unsuccessful in these academic subject classes; e.g., math, English, and history. The success ratings were earned in art and home economics. Student A5 also earned a moderately successful rating in Teacher AH's reading skills class, which was a remedial class for students who were below grade level in their reading skills.

In summary, the target students who were rated as alienate participants in grade six showed a mixed pattern of success in their transitions to junior high school. For the most part, they were less successful academically than socially. If Student A7 can serve as an example of the differences in student success that occur when a student makes a general change in his or her participation characteristics in seventh grade, from those of an alienate participant to some other category (in this instance, a phantom), his greater

success in all the success criteria compared with the other students reinforces the rather obvious thesis that alienate participation leads to unsatisfactory performance in several aspects of school. Given that alienates are described as students who purposefully confront the teacher and the learning situation, it is interesting to note that the three target students who continued to exhibit alienate characteristics seemed to exert this form of behavior in relation to the academic rather than the social aspects of the instructional system. At least, they were judged to be more successful in adapting to the classroom rules and norms and in establishing nonhostile peer relations that they were in their earned-grade performance, their academic behavior in class, or their overall success in transition.

Success of Students Rated as Phantom Participants in Grade Six

Students A9, A10, A11, and A12 were rated as phantom participants by their sixth-grade teachers. This suggests that in grade six these students were quiet members of their classes, seldom interacting with the teacher or other students, but nonetheless completing assigned tasks at an adequate, or better, level of performance. The information presented in Chapter Two further indicated that three of these four students continued to exhibit phantom participation characteristics in the seventh-grade classes in which they were observed. Two of them, Students A11 and A12, also were rated as success participants in their seventh-grade classes. As was noted in Chapter Two, several teachers established rigid rules systems that allowed little interaction among students. From the teachers' perspectives, the quietness that fit the phantom rating apparently also was conducive to successful participation in their classes. Student A9 received an isolate as well as a phantom rating in one of his classes. This suggests that in this setting he became even more withdrawn than he was in grade six. Student A10 was rated only as a success/multitask participant in the two classes in which he was observed. Information follows regarding these students' success in transition to junior high school.

Beginning with the grade earned in the fall quarter of grade seven, the four "phantom" students' transitions to grade seven seem to have been more successful than unsuccessful. As reported in Table 3.2, Student A9 was moderately successful in two classes (received "C" grades) and unsuccessful in one class (received a "D" grade). Student A10 received grades of "A" and "B-" in the two classes in which he was observed, both of which equal a success rating. Student A11 was given moderately successful grades in the classes in which she was observed (two "C+" and one "C"). Student A12 was least successful in terms of grades earned. She received an unsuccessful grade in history ("D+"), and a credit grade in reading skills, which indicates she had not completed all the work assigned during fall quarter, and a "B-" grade in math.

Table 3.2

Transition Success of Target Students Rated as Phantom Participants in Grade Six

TARGET STUDENT	TRANSITION CRITERION	TEACHER						
		AA	AB	AE	AF	AI	AJ*	AJ*
A9 Male	Fall Quarter Grade	C (English)	D (History)	C (Math)				
	Academic Behavior	moderately successful	moderately successful	successful				
	Adaptation to Rules and Norms	unsuccessful	successful	successful				
	Peer Relations	successful	successful	successful				
	TOTAL	moderately successful	unsuccessful	successful				
A10 Male	Fall Quarter Grade				A (Art)			B- (History)
	Academic Behavior				successful			successful
	Adaptation to Rules and Norms				successful			successful
	Peer Relations				successful			successful
	TOTAL				successful			successful
A11 Female	Fall Quarter Grade		C+ (English)	C (Math)				C+ (History)
	Academic Behavior		successful	successful				successful
	Adaptation to Rules and Norms		successful	successful				successful
	Peer Relations		moderately successful	moderately successful				successful
	TOTAL		successful	successful				successful
A12 Female	Fall Quarter Grade					Credit (Reading)	B- (Math)	D+ (History)
	Academic Behavior					successful	successful	unsuccessful
	Adaptation to Rules and Norms					successful	successful	successful
	Peer Relations					moderately successful	successful	successful
	TOTAL					moderately successful	successful	unsuccessful

* Teacher AJ is listed twice because of one of the target students was assigned to this teacher for two subject areas.

The pattern of lower grades in academic subjects that was found for the students with alienate participation characteristics did not occur for the phantom participants. They were successful or moderately successful in all the math classes in which they were observed and moderately successful in the English classes. History seems to have provided the most problems for these students. Two of the three unsuccessful grades were earned in history classes. It is interesting to note that the history classes in which these grades were earned were not taught by the same teacher, so the new content may have been the aspect of the class that was difficult for the students. Having said this, however, it is necessary to note that two other of the phantom students earned successful or moderately successful grades in history and were taught by the same teacher who taught Student A12, who earned a "D+."

The academic behavior ratings for these students were predominantly success ratings. The students were rated as successful in their ability to stay on-task, complete work correctly, and respond accurately to teachers' questions in eight of the eleven classes in which they were observed. They received moderately successful ratings in two additional classes. Only one unsuccessful rating was given; this was to Student A12 in her history class. Inasmuch as three of these students continued to exhibit phantom participation characteristics in seventh grade, such high success ratings are to be expected for this criterion. Attending to assigned work and not talking with others are typical behaviors for these students. Such behavior should result in high academic behavior ratings. Since this critierion also considers the correctness of the students' responses to assigned work and to teachers' oral questions, the similarity in these success ratings and earned grades also is expected.

Again, as might be expected of phantom students, 10 of the 11 ratings for adaptation to classroom rules and norms were success ratings. One unsuccessful rating was given. This was to Student A9 in Teacher AA's English class. In this class, the teacher established rules and norms that allowed the students to determine whether their talking was at an acceptable level that did not disturb others. Interestingly, in this situation, Student A9 became more withdrawn from the classroom group than in his other classes. As a result, he did not participate in the kinds of interactions with the teacher and other students that were required; hence the unsuccessful rating.

Given that these students were known for their lack of interaction with others, the large number of success ratings given for the peer relations criterion is unexpected. The students were rated successful in their relations with their peers in eight of the classes in which they were observed and received moderately successful ratings in the other three. However, previous research (see Ward, et al.) at the elementary school level indicates that these students generally are liked by their peers and that other students initiate interaction with them even though they seldom

start conversations, and so forth, on their own. Apparently, this same circumstance prevailed in the junior high school classes.

Based on the ratings reported above for the individual success criteria, a predominance of "total" success ratings would be anticipated. While more successful and moderately successful than unsuccessful ratings were given, the distribution of ratings listed in Table 3.2 tends more toward moderate and unsuccessful ratings than expected. Across the eleven classes in which the students were observed, five successful ratings, four moderately successful, and two unsuccessful ratings were given when the students' transitions to junior high school were viewed as total experiences. Apparently, in the raters' judgment, students who evidence phantom participation characteristics in grade six and continue to participate in the same ways in grade seven have beginning junior high school experiences that are adequately successful, but not outstanding. Similar to the ratings given for grades earned for fall quarter of seventh-grade, the two unsuccessful ratings that were given were for students' transitions in history classes.

Looking across the eleven classes in terms of the presence of the instructional features that differentiated among the seventh-grade classrooms, there does not appear to be a definite pattern of presence or absence of the features in the classrooms where the students received moderately successful or unsuccessful ratings compared with successful ones. Patterns for individual students can be noted, however. For example, Student A9 was unsuccessful in Teacher AB's classroom, in which a rigid rule system was established that allowed little interaction among students; he was moderately successful in Teacher AA's classroom, where a more flexible rule system existed, and was successful in Teacher AE's class, where rules were loosely enforced. Hence he seems to have had a more positive experience, overall, when the classroom behavior demands were somewhat relaxed. Student A10, who was rated as a success/multitask participant in his seventh-grade classes, also received a total-transition success rating in each class. Student A11 was successful in the three classes in which she was observed, two of which had rigid rule systems and one of which had a system that was applied somewhat erratically. Student A12, interestingly, was successful in one of Teacher AJ's classes and not in the other, although Teacher AJ functioned in much the same manner in both classes. Here, the subject matter area -- math vs. history -- seems to have been the deciding factor. Also, while Teacher AJ was accessible to students in both her math and history classes, she was more active in her monitoring of the students in the math class. This may have influenced Student A12's performance in this class in ways that resulted in a more successful transition here.

In summary, the target students rated as phantom participants in grade six for the most part made successful transitions to grade seven. Surprisingly, they were successful in establishing relations with their peers as well as in the academic and classroom behavior areas. The ratings further suggest that the overall impact of the junior high school transition may be less

successful for these students than their performances relative to the individual success criteria. Nonetheless, these students appear to face few problems in their move from elementary to junior high school.

Success of Students Rated as Dependent Participants in Grade Six

Eight target students were selected who were rated as dependent students by their sixth-grade teachers. They are students A13 through A20. The primary characteristic of dependent students is their need for frequent assistance and feedback from the teacher or other students in order to remain on-task and complete assigned work successfully. Since data summarized in Chapter Two indicate that several teachers at Waverley were not readily accessible to help their students, the transition success of these eight students is of particular interest. Table 3.3 reports the success ratings they received for each of the four criteria and their total transition success scores.

With regard to grades earned at the end of the fall quarter of seventh grade, the predominance of moderately successful grades received by these students is striking. Across the eight target students' descriptions, their behavior was described in 22 seventh-grade classes. (It must be noted that more than one target student was observed in each class. Thus the 22 classes do not necessarily represent 22 different classes. Rather, the number 22 indicates the number of distinct descriptions of dependent target students' observed behavior that are contained in all their case descriptions combined.) The students received "C+," "C," or "C-" grades in 18 of these classes. Two students, Students A13 and A20 received one success grade each, both of which were in English classes. Students A14 and A19 each received one unsuccessful grade. These were in history classes. Hence, relative to this success criterion, the obvious pattern for these students was to be moderately successful.

The students' ratings on the academic behavior criterion were more diverse than on grades earned. Relative to their ability to remain on-task, complete their work correctly, and answer the teacher's oral questions correctly and completely, the students were given 10 success ratings, 5 moderately successful ratings, and 7 unsuccessful ratings. The subject taught in the class in which the students were observed does not appear to be related to the rating received. Students received successful and unsuccessful ratings in English, history, and math classes. The moderately successful ratings were given in math and history classes. Another finding suggests that students rated as dependent participants who receive an unsuccessful rating in one class tend to receive this rating in other classes as well; examples are Students A14, A15, and A16. None of these three students received a successful rating; each received two unsuccessful and one moderately successful rating. (Student A19 differed from this pattern somewhat, receiving one

Table 3.3

Transition Success of Target Students Rated as Dependent Participants in Grade Six

TARGET STUDENT	TRANSITION CRITERION	TEACHER					
		AA	AB	AD	AE	AI	AJ
A13 Female	Fall Quarter Grade	B (English)		C- (Math)			C+ (History)
	Academic Behavior	successful		moderately successful			successful
	Adaptation to Rules and Norms	successful		moderately successful			successful
	Peer Relations	successful		successful			successful
	TOTAL	successful		unsuccessful			successful
A14 Female	Fall Quarter Grade	C+ (English	D (History)	C- (Math)			
	Academic Behavior	unsuccessful	moderately successful	unsuccessful			
	Adaptation to Rules and Norms	unsuccessful	moderately successful	unsuccessful			
	Peer Relations	successful	successful	successful			
	TOTAL	moderately successful	unsuccessful	unsuccessful			
A15 Male	Fall Quarter Grade	C (English)	C (History)	C (Math)			
	Academic Behavior	unsuccessful	unsuccessful	moderately successful			
	Adaptation to Rules and Norms	successful	successful	unsuccessful			
	Peer Relations	unsuccessful	unsuccessful	unsuccessful			
	TOTAL	unsuccessful	unsuccessful	unsuccessful			
A16 Male	Fall Quarter Grade		C (English)		C+ (Math)		C- (History)
	Academic Behavior		unsuccessful		moderately successful		unsuccessful
	Adaptation to Rules and Norms		unsuccessful		unsuccessful		unsuccessful
	Peer Relations		unsuccessful		successful		unsuccessful
	TOTAL		unsuccessful		successful		unsuccessful

Table 3.3 (continued)

Transition Success of Target Students Rated as Phantom Participants in Grade Six

TARGET STUDENT	TRANSITION CRITERION	TEACHER					
		AA	AB	AD	AE	AI	AJ
A17 Female	Fall Quarter Grade		C (English)			C+ (Reading)	C- (History)
	Academic Behavior		successful			successful	successful
	Adaptation to Rules and Norms		successful			successful	successful
	Peer Relations		moderately successful			successful	successful
	TOTAL		successful			successful	successful
A18 Female	Fall Quarter Grade		C+ (English)	C (Math)			C- (History)
	Academic Behavior		successful	successful			moderately successful
	Adaptation to Rules and Norms		successful	successful			unsuccessful
	Peer Relations		successful	moderately successful			successful
	TOTAL		successful	successful			unsuccessful
A19 Male	Fall Quarter Grade	C- (English)					F (History)
	Academic Behavior	successful					unsuccessful
	Adaptation to Rules and Norms	unsuccessful					unsuccessful
	Peer Relations	successful					successful
	TOTAL	moderately successful					unsuccessful
A20 Female	Fall Quarter Grade		B (English)	C (Math)			
	Academic Behavior		successful	successful			
	Adaptation to Rules and Norms		successful	successful			
	Peer Relations		successful	successful			
	TOTAL		successful	successful			

successful and one unsuccessful rating.) Referring back to the students' seventh-grade participation characteristics (see Chapter Two), it is interesting to note that in four of the seven cases in which the students received unsuccessful ratings, they were rated as exhibiting the characteristics of alienate participants. In one additional instance, the student was described as an isolate. Further, in only two of the seven instances were these students described as continuing to be dependent participants. Thus it seems that students who are dependent participants in grade six and who do not participate successfully in their seventh-grade classes change their mode of participation to one that is more confrontational than that which they exhibited in grade six.

The above finding is of particular interest because it suggests that these students are moving to less productive patterns of participation in the junior high school setting. Looking at the classes in which these changes occurred, the instructional features of the classrooms do not provide much explanation for the changes. For instance, other students who were rated as dependent participants in grade six received successful academic behavior ratings in these same classes. However, it is noteworthy that the students who received success ratings in these classrooms also changed their participation patterns. Without exception, the classes in which the students received success ratings were ones in which they were rated as either success/multitask, social, or phantom participants (or some combination thereof) rather than as dependent participants. This suggests that it is the students' mode of participation that is the most important contributor to successful academic behavior in the classroom, which is as one would predict. The contrast between confrontational alienate participation and on-task success/multitask or phantom participation would be expected to influence the students' academic behavior ratings.

The students' ratings for success in adapting to the rules and norms of the classrooms in which they were observed also was diverse. Across the 22 observation cases, the students received 10 successful ratings, 4 moderately successful ratings, and 8 unsuccessful ratings. The students who received the unsuccessful ratings for this criterion were the same students who received unsuccessful academic behavior ratings. However, the classes in which they received the unsuccessful ratings varied to some extent. For instance, Student A15 successfully adapted to the rigid rule system established and enforced by Teacher AB, even though he was not successful in terms of academic behavior in this class. Likewise, Student A19 adapted successfully to Teacher AJ's rigid rule system, but was rated as an unsuccessful academic participant. Further, Student A16 was less successful in adapting to Teacher AE's rule system, which was vague and erratically enforced, than he was in his academic behavior in this class. In contrast, he was more successful adapting to Teacher AJ's rigid rule system than remaining on-task in the class. Apparently, students who change to alienate or isolate participation characteristics in grade seven require rigid rules systems that control their interactions with others in order

to carry out classroom procedures appropriately, but these same rules do not appear to help them increase their attention to assigned academic tasks. This suggests that these students probably are spending large amounts of time not working, perhaps because they cannot obtain the help they need to move ahead with their work in classrooms where little, if any, teacher-student or student-student interaction is allowed.

The peer relations ratings reported in Table 3.3 indicate that, with the exception of the three boys (Students A15, A16, and A19) who became alienate participants, these students were able to establish successful or moderately successful peer relations. In fact, the case descriptions suggest that many of the students who were rated as dependent participants in grade six used their peers in grade seven to provide the help and feedback they needed to complete their work successfully. Again, the problems faced by the three students who received unsuccessful ratings are to be expected, given their alienate participation characteristics in these classes.

It will be recalled that the ratings of a student's total success in transition describe the raters' judgments regarding the student's experience in junior high school, in general. It is not derived by summing or averaging the score the student received on the other four success criteria. In this regard, the students who were dependent participants in grade six were slightly more successful than unsuccessful in their transition to junior high school. The students received 10 successful total transition ratings, 2 moderately successful ratings, and 10 unsuccessful ratings. As expected, Students A14, A15, and A16 received most of the unsuccessful ratings; 8 of the 10. The successful transition ratings all were given to students who exhibited participation characteristics that are descriptive of participation categories other than dependent. In fact, dependent participation seemed to lead to an unsuccessful transition unless the student was in a classroom with a flexible rule system that allowed him or her to obtain help from other students as well as the teacher. If a rigid rule system was in place, it was essential for the teacher to be accessible to students in order for the students' overall transition to be successful. Further, in addition to the problems faced by alienate participants, a participation pattern that seems to be linked with an unsuccessful total transition rating is that of a dependent/phantom. Only one student who was described as this sort of participant in grade seven earned a positive total transition score. This was Student A19, who earned a moderately successful rating in Teacher AA's class, where the rule system allowed students to interact, and the teacher also was readily accessible to the students. All other students who exhibited this combination of participation characteristics were unsuccessful. They apparently did not receive the help and feedback they needed when they became quiet members of the classroom. This was the case even in classes where the teacher was accessible, if the teacher also established a rigid rule system that did not allow the students to interact with one another.

Success of Students Rated as
Social Participants in Grade Six

Students A21, A22, A23, and A24 were rated as social participants by their sixth-grade teachers. This suggests that, in their sixth-grade classrooms, the students frequently initiated interaction with their peers, often contributed to classroom discussions, and sometimes acted as peer teachers. If these same characteristics occurred in grade seven, one would expect these students to devote a considerable amount of class time to talking with their peers and to initiate interaction with the teacher, rather than waiting for the teacher to come to them to provide help and feedback. Some of them also might provide dependent students the help and feedback they need to complete their work successfully.

Table 3.4 reports the transition success ratings for these four target students. Beginning with the grade earned at the end of fall quarter in the classes in which they were observed, the students earned grades of "A," "B," or "B-" in nine of the 12 cases where observations were conducted. "C" grades were earned in the remaining three classes. Based on this criterion, the social students' transitions were successful.

The academic behavior ratings for these students also are predominantly successful or moderately successful. Only three unsuccessful ratings were given. Student A21 was rated as not attending to assigned work in two of her classes, Teacher AE's math class and Teacher AG's music class. Student A23 was given an unsuccessful rating in Teacher AD's math class. No information is available regarding Student A21's participation characteristics in the music class. In the math class, she was described as a dependent/phantom participant rather than a social participant. In Teacher AA's English class, where she received a moderately successful rating, she was described as a social participant. Student A23 was described as an alienate participant in the class in which he received an unsuccessful rating, a social participant in one class where his academic behavior rating was successful, and a success/social participant in the other. Hence it appears that movement out of the social participation category to an alienate or a dependent category contributes to students being less successful with regard to attention to and completion of assigned work in seventh-grade. This supposition is further supported by data regarding the participation characteristics of the students who were rated as exhibiting successful academic behavior in all the grade seven observations. With one exception -- Student A24's performance in Teacher AG's history class -- all the students who received successful ratings were described as success/multitask, success/phantom, success/social, or social participants. Student A24 was described as a phantom participant in the history class. Hence the students who were on-task and completed their work correctly in grade seven were the ones who either remained as social participants or modified their participation in ways that represent other participation categories that are described here as being related to successful transition. In addition, all the classrooms in which

Table 3.4

Transition Success of Target Students Rated as Social Participants in Grade Six

TARGET STUDENT	TRANSITION CRITERION	TEACHER						
		AA	AB	AC	AD	AE	AG	AJ
A21 Female	Fall Quarter Grade	B- (English)				C (Math)	C (Music)	
	Academic Behavior	moderately successful				unsuccessful	unsuccessful	
	Adaptation to Rules and Norms	successful				unsuccessful	unsuccessful	
	Peer Relations	successful				successful	successful	
	TOTAL	successful				unsuccessful	unsuccessful	
A22 Female	Fall Quarter Grade		B- (English)			B (Math)	A (Music)	
	Academic Behavior		successful			successful	successful	
	Adaptation to Rules and Norms		successful			successful	successful	
	Peer Relations		successful			moderately successful	successful	
	TOTAL		successful			successful	successful	
A23 Male	Fall Quarter Grade	B (English)			C (Math)			B (History)
	Academic Behavior	successful			unsuccessful			successful
	Adaptation to Rules and Norms	successful			unsuccessful			moderately successful
	Peer Relations	successful			successful			moderately successful
	TOTAL	successful			unsuccessful			successful
A24 Male	Fall Quarter Grade			A (English)	B (Math)		A (History)	
	Academic Behavior			successful	unsuccessful		successful	
	Adaptation to Rules and Norms			successful	moderately successful		successful	
	Peer Relations			successful	successful		successful	
	TOTAL			successful	successful		successful	

the students received successful ratings were ones in which the teacher was accessible to the students. This suggests that the social students continued to perform satisfactorily in settings where they could initiate interaction with the teacher for whatever purposes they required.

At first glance, one might expect students who were social participants in grade six to have difficulty adapting to the rules and norms of the different classrooms to which they are assigned in grade seven. For the most part, this does not appear to have occurred. The students received successful ratings for this criterion in seven cases, moderately successful ratings in two, and unsuccessful ratings in three. The students who had unsuccessful ratings for this criterion were the same ones who received unsuccessful academic behavior ratings. Thus movement to a dependent or alienate participation category appears to have affected the students' performance in this area as well.

As would be expected, all the students who were rated as social participants in grade six were either successful or moderately successful in establishing positive relations with their peers in grade seven. The predominance of the ratings were in the success category (10 of 12) and none were in the unsuccessful category. Inasmuch as some of the students were described as assuming phantom participation characteristics in a few classes (e.g., Student A22 was described as a success/phantom participant in all three classes in which she was observed), it is interesting to note that these quiet characteristics do not appear to have had a negative impact on the students peer relations; nor do the alienate and dependent characteristics seem to have affected these ratings.

When the students' total success in transition is considered, again these students seem to have been successful. Across the 12 observation cases, the students received successful ratings in nine. Three unsuccessful ratings were given. These were for the same students and in the same classes as the unsuccessful ratings that were reported for academic behavior and adaptation to classroom rules and norms. Thus it appears that students who are social participants in grade six are successful in their transitions to junior high school so long as they continue to be social participants, or, if they change, the change is in the direction of being a success/multitask participant or a phantom participant. Interestingly, these two positive changes both represent participation patterns that reduce the extent to which a student initiates interaction with others but increase the extent to which the student attends to assigned tasks without monitoring from the teacher. This may suggest that these students were becoming less dependent on the teacher as they progressed through school, since their social behavior in grade six may have been a result of a need to obtain teacher help and feedback.

Relative to the instructional features of the classrooms in which these students were successful or unsuccessful, two features may be important. Teacher accessibility was discussed above. The

extent to which the teacher established and enforced rules and norms also may be important. Of the three classrooms in which students' overall transitions were unsuccessful, two (Teacher AE's and Teacher AD's) were ones in which the teacher did not establish and consistently enforce rules. Further, Teacher AG's rule system in the music class was less consistently enforced than in the history class. It must be underlined that this relationship applies only to the students who exhibited dependent or alienate participation characteristics in grade seven. The other students were successful in whatever classes they were observed, some of which were one of Teacher AE's math classes or Teacher AG's music classes.

Success of Students Rated as Success/Multitask Participants in Grade Six

Table 3.5 reports the transition success ratings for the target students who were rated as success/multitask participants in their sixth-grade classes. Perusal of the grades earned at the end of fall quarter in the classes in which they were observed suggests that three of the target students were successful and one was less successful. Student A25 received "C+" or "C" grades in all three classes in which he was observed -- grades considered to be indicative of moderate success. In contrast, Student A27 earned all "A" or "A-" grades, Student A26 earned two "B+'s" and one "A-," and Student A28 received two "B's" and one "B-"; all of which are equivalent to successful ratings.

Considering the three students who earned the better grades in comparison with Student A25, the only factor that offers a plausible explanation for the differences -- and this is a questionable conjecture -- is the confrontational manner Student A25 assumed in his interactions with the teachers and other students. As the year progressed, Student A25 became less work-oriented and more social in his classes. Often this social participation involved unpleasant encounters. This form of behavior lead Teacher AC to describe him as an alienate participant. Although the other two teachers did not describe Student A25 in the same way, his frequent interactions with others may have prevented him from completing his work successfully in these classes as well.

The ratings for academic behavior also indicate that these students were predominantly successful. They were rated as exhibiting successful academic behavior in 9 of the 12 classes in which they were observed. A moderately successful rating was given Student A28 in Teacher AD's math class. Student A25 received a successful rating in Teacher AG's history class and unsuccessful ratings in Teacher AC's English class and Teacher AD's math class. One feature of the classes in which the students received moderately successful or unsuccessful ratings that warrants comment is the lack of rigidly enforced rules and norms. Teacher AD was notorious for his failure to sanction students' off-task behavior. Teacher AC established a system that was flexible, allowing students to interact so long as they did not disturb students who wished to work. Apparently

Table 3.5

Transition Success of Target Students Rated as Success/Multitask Participants in Grade Six

TARGET STUDENT	TRANSITION CRITERION	TEACHER AA	AB	AC	AD	AE	AG	AJ	AK
A25 Male	Fall Quarter Grade			C+ (English)	C (math)		C (History)		
	Academic Behavior			unsuccessful	unsuccessful		successful		
	Adaptation to Rules and Norms			moderately successful	successful		successful		
	Peer Relations			successful	successful		successful		
	TOTAL			moderately successful	moderately successful		successful		
A26 Male	Fall Quarter Grade	B+ (English)				B+ (Math)			A- (Home Economics)
	Academic Behavior	successful				successful			successful
	Adaptation to Rules and Norms	successful				successful			successful
	Peer Relations	successful				successful			successful
	TOTAL	successful				successful			successful
A27 Female	Fall Quarter Grade	A (English)*		A (English)*				A- (History)	
	Academic Behavior	successful		successful				successful	
	Adaptation to Rules and Norms	successful		successful				successful	
	Peer Relations	successful		successful				successful	
	TOTAL	successful		successful				successful	
A28 Female	Fall Quarter Grade	B (English)	B- (History)		B (Math)				
	Academic Behavior	successful	successful		moderately successful				
	Adaptation to Rules and Norms	successful	successful		successful				
	Peer Relations	successful	unsuccessful		successful				
	TOTAL	successful	successful		successful				

* Target Student A27 spent part of Fall Quarter in the class of Teacher AC. She was transferred to Teacher AA Since her transition success ratings are based on data obtained in teach class, both are listed here.

Teacher AD's failure to keep students on-task and the simplicity of the work he assigned encouraged the two students who were in his classes to engage in nonacademic behavior. In addition, for Student A25, Teacher AC's flexible rules do not appear to have been sufficient to keep Student A25's attention focused on the assigned work. It must be noted that this was not the case for Student A27, however. She received a successful academic behavior rating in Teacher AC's class in which she was observed.

When it came to adapting to classroom rules and norms, the target students who were rated as success/multitask participants in grade six seemed to have no problems. In 11 of the 12 cases, their behavior received a successful rating. The twelfth rating was moderately successful. Even Student A25 received two successful ratings, as well as the one moderately successful rating, for this criterion.

Likewise, 11 of the 12 peer interaction ratings were at a successful level. Student A28 received an unsuccessful rating in Teacher AB's history class because she isolated herself from the other students, almost never talking with any of them. Since the other students also did not attempt to talk with Student A28, the raters determined that her relations with her peers in this class were unsatisfactory.

In terms of the success of the students' overall transition experience, the ratings indicate that the transitions were successful. Students A26, A27, and A28 received successful transition ratings in all the classes in which they were observed. Student A25 was given a successful rating in Teacher AG's history class and moderately successful ratings in the other two classes.

Based on these ratings, it would seem that the students who were judged by their sixth-grade teachers to be success/multitask students made successful transitions to junior high school. This occurred even though several of the students were described as exhibiting different forms of participation in their seventh-grade classes. For example, Students A26 and A27 were described as social participants in most of the seventh-grade classes in which they were observed. Student A26 was described as an alienate participant in one class. Nevertheless, these students appeared to be able to mix socializing and the type of work assigned at Waverley in ways that, on the whole, made it possible for them to be successful in their classes.

Since these students generally were successful, relationships among the instructional features of the classrooms and the students' success in transition do not appear to be significant. The possible importance of the establishment of and enforcement of classroom rules and norms was mentioned above. In addition, Student A28's lack of success in establishing positive peer relations in Teacher AB's class suggests that the rigid rule system in that class may have posed problems for a student who was a success/multitask and also a phantom participant. Being placed in a setting in which interaction was restricted

rather than encouraged did appear to provide a means for Student A28 to establish contact with other students.

Summary

Across all 24 target students, it is clear that more of the students were successful or moderately successful in their transition to junior high school than were unsuccessful. Relative to the grade earned at the end of the fall quarter of seventh-grade, using each class in which a target student was observed as one data point (which results in a total of 70 data points), the target students received "A" or "B" grades (successful ratings) in 37 percent of the classes. They received "C" grades, or were moderately successful, in 51 percent of the classes. They were unsuccessful, receiving "D" or "F" grades, in 11 percent of the classes.

The target students were rated as exhibiting successful academic behavior in 51 percent of the classes, moderately successful behavior in 17 percent, and unsuccessful behavior in 31 percent. Given that academic behavior has been shown to be correlated with student achievement as measured by standardized tests, the differences in percentages of students receiving the various ratings on this criterion compared with the grade earned is interesting. It would appear that the teachers were applying standards that required more than on-task behavior, correct completion of work, and correct responses to the teacher's oral questions in order to obtain a "high" grade. Possible explanations for the unsuccessful ratings were discussed above for students with various participation characteristics. In most cases, students who were described by their teachers as alienate and/or dependent participants in their seventh-grade classes had lower ratings on the academic behavior criterion than students who were rated as phantom, social, or success/multitask participants. This seemed to be the most signifcant factor that differentiated among the students' ratings.

Adaptation to classroom rules and norms seemed to offer few problems to the target students. Sixty-one percent received sucessful ratings for this criterion; ten percent were rated at the moderately successful level; twenty-nine percent were rated as unsuccessful. The unsuccessful ratings concentrated around a few students who were rated as unsuccessful in all, or most, of the classes in which they were observed. Other explanations differed based on the students' participation characteristics. These are discussed above in terms of each participation category.

The students were highly successful in establishing positive relations with their peers. Contrary to some of the statements referenced in Chapter One, which suggested that students of this age find social relationships to be a difficult problem, the target students were rated as successful in this regard in 74 percent of the classes in which they were observed. Moderately successful ratings were assigned for 7 percent of the cases. Nineteen percent were

rated as unsuccessful. Again, these unsuccessful ratings were the result of the negative performance of a few students.

The total transition success ratings for the students likewise indicated that over half the students had made acceptable transitions to junior high school by the end of the fall quarter of seventh-grade. The students were given successful ratings in 59 percent of their observation cases. Another 13 percent were rated at the moderately successful level. Only 28 percent were assigned unsuccessful ratings.

Thus it would seem that the target students who were observed as they made their transition from elementary to junior high school, by and large, were successful. Further, the participation characteristics a student exhibited in his or her seventh-grade classes seemed to be related to the success that was achieved. In particular, students who received alternate or dependent ratings in seventh-grade, regardless of their sixth-grade participation rating, seemed to have more problems than students who were described as participating in other ways. The next section of this chapter looks at the students' success based on these seventh-grade participation characteristics.

Relative to the relationship among the instructional features of the classrooms in which the target students were observed and the students' overall success in transition, several trends are of interest. First, Teacher AA had a higher percentage of the students observed in his English classes make successful overall transitions than any other teacher. Seventy-three percent of these target students received successful ratings. 18 percent received moderately successful ratings, and 9 percent were judged unsucessful. Teacher AD had the highest percentage of unsuccessful students, 45 percent, across all the teachers. Comparing Teacher AA and Teacher AD, the most obvious difference between the two teachers is that Teacher AA's classrooms comprised all four of the instructional features that were found to differentiate among the seventh-grade classes; Teacher AD's classes employed none of them. Apparently, presence of these features increases students' opportunities to make successful transitions from elementary to secondary school.

When all the teachers who taught academic subjects are included in the sample for comparison of students' success, two additional patterns are found. First, the teachers who had more than half their students make successful overall transitions either (a) were concerned with the students' interest in the work that was to be done and attempted to make the content relevant to the students' current lives or, (b) in the case of Teacher AE, where the observers made no mention of this aspect of the classroom, were less content-coverage focused than the teachers in whose classes the students were less successful. For example, in addition to Teacher AA, Teacher AC had 66 percent of the target students observed in his class make successful overall transitions, Teacher AE had 63 percent, Teacher AG had 60 percent, and Teacher AJ had 58 percent. These four teachers and Teacher AA were more student- than content-focused. Second, the difficulty of the history classes is evident. Although more than half

the target students who were observed in Teacher AJ's classes received successful ratings for their overall transitions; 42 percent did not. Further, Teacher AB, the other teacher who taught primarily history, had 45 percent of the students rated as successful, 18 percent as moderately successful, and 36 percent as unsuccessful. With regard to Teacher AB's class, it also is worth noting that she established the most rigid rule system observed across all the classes and enforced this system equally rigidly. In addition, she was the only other teacher, besides Teacher AD, about whom the observers made negative comments regarding the clarity of her instruction. Thus it appears that the combination of the rigid rule system and unclear instructions made it difficult for some students to perform successfully in this class. It is likely that the unsuccessful students did not understand the assignments that were given and, because of the rule system, did not obtain the help they needed to complete their work correctly.

Success of Target Student Transition to Junior High School Based on Participation Characteristics in Grade Seven

This section of the chapter reports the findings regarding the target students' success in transition to junior high school based on the participation characteristics they evidenced in the seventh-grade classes in which they were observed. Using each of the individual classroom observation case descriptions that were developed for the target students as a data point, it is possible to consider 68 cases in which a target student was observed in one of the classes to which (s)he was assigned, and that student's participation also was described by the seventh-grade teacher (or, in a few instances, the observer) based on the Classroom Participation Observation Coding instrument. Since the above discussion provides extensive data regarding the four individual transition success criteria for each student and, when relevant, discusses possible relationships between the individual ratings and the student's participation in grade seven as well as grade six, these discussions are not repeated here. The discussion that follows is concerned with the relationships between the students' participation in their seventh-grade classes and total success in transition.

Table 3.6 reports the percent of target students who were described as exhibiting characteristics that are indicative of various classroom participation categories and who received successful, moderately successful, and unsuccessful total transition ratings. As noted above, the data in the table are based on the number of students who were described as fitting within a particular participation category in one or more of the classes in which they were observed noted as Number of Observation Cases on the table -- and the portion of these students who received a successful, moderately successful, or unsuccessful rating.

Table 3.6

Percent of Target Students Rated as Successful in Transition to Junior High School Based on Participation Characteristics in Grade Seven

Participation Category	Alienate and Alienate/Phantom	Phantom and Phantom/Isolate	Dependent/ Phantom	Social and Social/Success	Success
Number of Observation Cases	14	17	2	12	17
Percent Successful Transition Cases	.07	.53	.50	.92	1.00
Percent Moderately Successful Transition Rating	.21	.12	.00	.08	.00
Percent Unsuccessful Transition Rating	.71	.35	.50	.00	.00

Perusal of Table 3.6 readily demonstrates that students who were described by their seventh-grade teachers as alienate or alienate/phantom participants largely were unsuccessful in their transition to junior high school. Seventy-one percent of these students received unsuccessful ratings; only seven percent were rated as successful.

Students who were described as dependent and dependent/phantom participants also appeared to have problems in their seventh-grade classes. Fifty percent of these students were unsuccessful. It is interesting to note that the dependent/phantom students seemed to have more problems than the students who merely were described as dependent participants. Only 17 percent of the dependent/phantom students were judged to have made successful transitions to junior high school while 50 percent of the dependent students were given this rating. Possible explanations for this situation were discussed earlier. They center on the assumption that a student who is dependent and also is a phantom participant will be less apt to seek and obtain the help and feedback (s)he requires in order to complete assigned tasks successfully. This notion is supported by the relationship that seems to exist between classroom rules and norms and the success of the dependent/phantom students. The students who were in classes where the teacher established a set of rules and norms that was flexible (e.g., allowed students to interact with one another and to initiate interaction with the teacher, so long as the conversations did not disturb others) received successful or moderately successful transition ratings. Those who were in classrooms with rigid rule systems (e.g., students were not allowed to talk with one another) or classrooms in which the teacher failed to establish and enforce rules and norms, were not successful. Apparently, these students require the structure provided by rules and norms, but also need to be able to interact with other students in order to remain on-task and complete work successfully. It is interesting to note that, although one would expect that teacher accessibility also would be important to these students' success, the data suggest that accessible teachers in classrooms with rigid rules systems were not sought out by these students, and apparently the students were not contacted often enough by the teacher to receive the necessary help and feedback. The teachers in the classes in which the students were successful were accessible and established flexible rules systems as well.

The data in Table 3.6 further suggest that students who were described by the seventh-grade teachers as social, social/success, or success students were successful in moving from elementary to junior high school. None of these students received an unsuccessful total transition rating.

The remaining group of students who warrant attention are the phantoms and phantom/isolates. Based on the percentages reported in the table, approximately half these students seem to make a successful transition to junior high school. Another 12 percent were rated as moderately successful. Thirty-five percent were unsuccessful. The earlier discussion pointed out the fact that several of these students found the history classes to be difficult. Further, both

Teacher AB's history and English classes, in which the explanations were not clear, and the rule system discouraged interaction among the students or between the teacher and students (although Teacher AB was accessible if students initiated contact with her), proved to be difficult instructional settings for these students. Seventy-five percent of the students in the phantom or phantom/isolate category who were in Teacher AB's classes were given unsuccessful total transition ratings. Twenty-five percent received moderately successful ratings. This same pattern did not occur for the social or success students. No students in Teacher AB's classes were described as dependent participants, possibly because they had no opportunity to evidence those characteristics.

Given the success patterns reported in Table 3.6, it is clear that students who exhibit dependent, dependent/phantom, phantom, and phantom/isolate participation characteristics in grade seven require instructional settings in which one or more of the instructional features that differentiated among the seventh-grade classes are in operation. They appear to be the students who are most vulnerable if they are placed in an instructional setting in which the rule system is rigid, the teacher is unclear, and/or the teacher is not accessible. Social and success students make successful transitions to junior high school regardless of the classes to which they are assigned. Alienate participants seem to be largely unsuccessful no matter which instructional features are present in the classes. Thus, given limited resources (i.e., teachers and time), it appears that junior high school staffs would be well advised to exert whatever special efforts are needed to assist students in their transitions to secondary school, through careful selection of the classes to which certain kinds of students are assigned, to assure that the instructional features are present that will aid them in becoming successful students.

Conclusion and Relationship of Findings to Other Research

The data reported here suggest that some students' transitions to junior high school were successful; some were not. Further, students appeared to function differently in their various classrooms. In part, this seemed to be a result of the structure the teacher and students created. As Becker, et al. (1968), found, and as verified in this study, the structure varied from class to class and teacher to teacher. Some variations were based on the classes' cultures, including norms relative to "who should talk, how much they should talk, what kind of things they should say, how they should say them, and what the consequences [were] of behaving appropriately or otherwise" (Becker, p.75). This process of classroom interaction was found to serve as the forum for development of the shared meanings, expectations, and understandings that were essential for successful performance in each classroom.

The target student case descriptions and the data reported in this chapter, and in Chapter Two, provide examples of students who

succeeded in one class, but were unsuccessful in another, partly because they did not adapt to the structural and academic requirements of some settings, or because the students rebelled against these requirements. These successes and failures tended to be related to the participation ratings assigned by the students' sixth-grade teachers, but were more strongly related to the particpation ratings given by the seventh-grade teachers. Target students rated as exhibiting success or social participation characteristics had a relatively easy time adjusting to the classroom structures and cultures at Waverley. Phantom students had more difficulty, but, nonetheless, were more successful than unsuccessful. Alienate students generally were unsuccessful. The students in the dependent category were successful, given the presence of certain instructional features. These were availability of the teacher or other students to provide feedback and assistance, clarity of the teacher's explanations and instructions, and maintenance of a reasonable work environment that allowed some interaction among students. These instructional features are similar to the minimal learning needs Good and Power (1976) proposed in their discussion of the ways in which different types of students performed in grade eight.

Doyle (1979) suggested that teachers' directions often are incomplete and ambiguous and that students must rely on more than these communications if they wish to perform adequately in class. The target student case descriptions and the analysis of teachers' within-activity-structure behavior (see Volume II) support this contention. For example, in their interviews, the target students described various strategies for obtaining crucial, but unclear, information. More important perhaps, the transition success data reported here stress the problems faced by students who were unable to find acceptable ways to elicit this information from the teacher or other students.

Although it seems reasonable to assume that academics would be the dominant purpose of schooling at the junior high school level, and that students and teachers would be engaged in an "exchange of performance for grades" (see Becker, 1968; and Doyle, 1979), the data reported here also indicate that successful students were required to carry out numerous interactions with other students in order to complete their assigned tasks successfully. Further, the students who were described as social or success participants in the classroom were able to engage in socially oriented as well as academically oriented conversations with other students and, at the same time, successfully complete assigned tasks. In contrast, unsuccessful students, particularly students described as alienate participants, seemed to let procedural and social matters interfere with academic tasks.

Nonetheless, it is encouraging to note that students received successful or moderately successful total transition ratings in 70 percent of the 68 classroom cases that were included in the case descriptions. Hence the information reported here provides a basis for improvement of the education program offered to all students in the junior high/middle school level of schooling.

CHAPTER FOUR

SETTING, STUDY PARTICIPANTS, AND METHODOLOGY

The task of this chapter is to describe the data sets that provided the empirical grounding for the information reported in the previous chapters. We approach this task with the following organizational strategy. First, we discuss the setting in which the transition study was conducted. Second, we describe each of the populations and samples that were the focus of data collection efforts. We refer to this group collectively as Study Participants. Third, we delineate the way in which the data were collected and the analysis strategies employed.

To simplify the reporting of data sets, we have divided the data collection activities and resulting data sets into two temporal phases: Phase I and Phase II. Phase I includes data collection activities that occurred in May 1980. In terms of the students who were the focus of the transition study, this period coincides with the end of their sixth-grade year. Phase II data collection activities occurred between August 4, 1980 and November 21, 1980, and included students' first three months of junior high school. We turn below to a description of the setting in which the study was conducted.

Setting

The Junior High School Transition Study was conducted in a small city on the outskirts of a large metropolitan area. The city has undergone rapid growth during the last two decades. While a large portion of the city's work force now commutes into the central metropolitan area, the numerous feed mills remind the visitor that agriculture still plays a significant role in the city's economy.

The city and its immediately surrounding area includes 11 elementary school districts serving grades K-6 and one high school district serving grades 7-12. One of the elementary districts operates under a joint (single) administration and board of education. Students from all 11 elementary districts matriculate to the high school district for grades 7-12. The high school district comprises two comprehensive (grades 7-8) junior high schools, two comprehensive (grades 9-12) high schools, and a continuation high school. The transition study took place in one of the junior high schools (Waverley) and its feeder elementary schools.

Study Participants

Phase I

The following members of the school community participated in Phase I of the study.

Schools and teachers. All schools feeding into Waverley Junior High School were invited to participate in this phase of the study. These schools were six in total. All six schools agreed to administer the Student Opinion Survey as part of the districts' ongoing evaluation programs. (This data set is reported in Volume III.) Two schools, however, declined to participate in the classsroom observation aspect of the study because each contained only one sixth-grade classroom and anonymity of the teacher could not be maintained, given the type of data collection and reporting to be done.

Four schools and their sixth-grade teachers participated in Phase I of the study. These four schools were CH Dana, Bluff Street, Hawthorne, and JM Keynes. Table 4.1 lists the feeder schools and the teachers who participated in Phase I.

The seven teachers at CH Dana and JM Keynes grouped their classes into "clusters" and shared instruction of the students. The teachers at Bluff Street, Hawthorne, and one teacher at CH Dana taught self-contained classrooms.

Students. Students included in the sixth-grade phase of the study were those enrolled in the classes of the teachers noted above.

Phase II

The teachers, students, and parents who participated in Phase II of the transition study are as follows.

Teachers. The Phase II teacher sample was drawn from those teachers at Waverley who worked with seventh-grade students. A total of 21 teachers taught these students at least one period per day. Eleven of the 21 teachers agreed to participate in the study. Of the 10 who did not take part, 4 taught seventh-graders during only one period of the day, one taught foreign language classes, and 3 taught physical education. No observations were conducted in physical education classes because of the difficulty of following students and hearing teacher-student interactions on the playing field.

Table 4.2 lists the teachers who participated in Phase II of the study. As can be noted from the table, these teachers taught the basic academic subjects, English, math, and history, as well as the elective reading skills course and the arts and crafts "block." The block classes comprised a series of nine-week courses in art, music, home economics, and woodshop. Students rotated through the block during the year. One remedial class -- math fundamentals -- also was observed.

Table 4.1

Sixth-Grade School and Teacher Sample and Data Collection in Which They Participated in Transition Study

	Cluster	Student Opinion Survey	Classroom Observations	Curriculum Interview	Student Participation Ratings
CH Dana					
Teacher 301	no	yes	yes	yes	yes
Teacher 302	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Teacher 303	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Teacher 304	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Teacher 305	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Bluff Street					
Teacher 401	no	yes	yes	yes	yes
Teacher 402	no	yes	yes	yes	yes
Hawthorne					
Teacher 601	no	yes	yes	yes	yes
Teacher 602	no	yes	yes	yes	yes
Teacher 603	no	yes	yes	yes	yes
JM Keynes					
Teacher 701	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Teacher 702	yes	yes	yes	yes	no*
Teacher 703	yes	yes	yes	yes	no*

*Teacher 701 assigned Student Participation Ratings for all students in the cluster (Teachers 701, 702, and 703).

Table 4.2

Classes in Which Phase II Teachers were Observed

Teachers	Subjects Observed In
Teacher AA	5 English 7 classes
Teacher AB	3 English 7 classes 2 World History classes
Teacher AC	1 English 7 class
Teacher AD	4 Math 7 classes
Teacher AE	3 Math 7 classes
Teacher AF	1 Art (Block) class
Teacher AG	1 Music (Block) class 1 World History class
Teacher AH	1 Reading Skills class
Teacher AI	1 Reading Skills class
Teacher AJ	4 World History classes 1 Math Fundamentals class
Teacher AK	2 Home Economics Block classes

Across the teachers in the sample, more than half the classes in which seventh-grade students were enrolled were covered. Thus an acceptable sample of seventh-grade teachers' and students' experiences during the first two months of school was included.

The 11 participating teachers included 5 female and 6 male teachers. The female teachers taught reading, home economics, history, math, and English. The male teachers taught English, art, math, reading, and music. Their teaching experience ranged from 2 years to 39 years, with a majority having taught more than 6 years. One of the 11 teachers was trained as an elementary teacher. All others had secondary training.

Students. While almost all students in Waverley's seventh grade participated in some aspects of the transition study, target student data provided the focus for this volume.

At the beginning of Phase II, 24 target students were selected, based on the following criteria:

-- The student came from a school participating in all aspects of the sixth-grade phase of the study.

-- The student was given a sixth-grade participation rating by his or her sixth-grade teacher.

-- The student had parental permission to participate in Phase II of the study.

There were 55 students in this group.

From this group, the target students were selected so that:

-- Target students could be observed in classes taught by the seventh-grade teachers participating in the study. Every effort was made to include a math and English class for each target student. Additional classes were included as observer scheduling permitted.

-- An equal number of boys and girls participated.

-- Across the sample, students who had been rated by their sixth-grade teachers as exhibiting a variety of classroom participation characteristics would be represented. However, no isolates had permission to participate, so this participation category was not represented.

-- Students from each of the four sixth-grade schools that participated completely in Phase I data collection were represented. Because of the restraints and complexities noted above, it was not possible to give each school equal representation. Students came from the following schools:

CH Dana:	5
Bluff Street:	5
Hawthorne:	6
JM Keynes:	8

In this manner, 24 target students were selected.

Parents. All parents of students who were scheduled to enter Waverley Junior High were invited by the EPSSP staff to be interviewed about their thoughts concerning their child's transition to junior high school. Fifty-five parents (roughly 13 percent) agreed to be interviewed. From this group, a sample of 34 parents was purposively selected. Attempts were made to ensure that parents of both boys and girls who had attended the majority of the feeder schools were represented in the interview sample. The final parent interview sample included 19 parents of boys and 15 of girls who had attended 5 of the 6 elementary schools feeding into Waverley.

Data Collection and Analysis

The data collection and analysis procedures applied during Phases I and II are outlined below.

Phase I

During the spring of the student sample's sixth-grade year, the transition study began. The data sets from this phase that were used in preparation of Parts A and B of this volume are discussed below.

Classroom observations. As noted above, 13 of the 15 sixth-grade teachers whose classes were scheduled to attend Waverley agreed to be observed by Far West researchers. Table 4.1 detailed this information.

When the data collectors entered these 13 classes, they were instructed to observe the following aspects of the classroom environment. First, the activity structures that the teacher had in place on the day of observation, and the nature of the interaction between teacher and students were described. During the observation period, the observer completed an "activity structures coding sheet" detailing the activity structure elements present or not present during each period of the day. Each class was observed for one full school day. At the end of the day, the observers prepared an "informal observation" narrative reporting on the teacher-student and student-student interactions that were observed, the discipline structure of the class, and other aspects of the classroom that the observer felt were significant.

Teacher interviews. At about the same time in May, the 13 teachers were interviewed by members of the transition study's professional staff. These interviews, labeled "curriculum interviews," elicited the teachers' instructional procedures and activity structures. The

interviewer probed carefully to obtain a complete picture of each teacher's activity structures, curriculum, and instructional procedures. Each interview lasted from two to three hours.

Student participation ratings. In addition to being interviewed about their curriculum, teachers were asked to assign their students "student participation ratings." The procedure was as follows. Teachers were given a list that provided descriptions of student attributes and classroom behavior and asked to indicate which description most closely resembled each student in their classroom.

After matching descriptions with students, one of six participation ratings was assigned. These six participation categories (e.g., success/multi-task, social, dependent, alienate, phantom, and isolate) were derived from a previous study (Ward, Tikunoff, Lash, Rounds & Mergendoller, 1981).

Student Opinion Survey (SOS). The Student Opinion Survey is a questionnaire designed to measure respondents' feelings about school, including their attitudes towards teachers, peers, schoolwork, several school subjects, and school in general. It is quite similar to an instrument developed by Power and Cotterell (1979) and used in their own study of students' transition to secondary school. The Student Opinion Survey was administered by the participating school districts as part of their regular evaluation programs. Students in all classrooms that supplied students to Waverley received this questionnaire.

The SOS is divided into three sections. Part A contains true-false questions that attempt to elicit feelings about school, teachers, and relations with peers. Part B of the SOS consists of a series of abbreviated semantic differential items that seek to tap feelings about teachers, school, and the following subjects: English, math, social studies, and science. Part C contains two open-ended questions about the student's sixth-grade experience and the anticipated seventh-grade experience.

Data analysis. The narratives from the classroom observations and teacher interviews were reviewed and analyzed to obtain a rich and complete portrait of the activity structures in the 13 sixth-grade classrooms. Based on these two data sets, a chart was prepared describing the activity structure elements for each subject taught in each sixth-grade classroom. (These charts are presented in Volume II of this report.)

Using the charts, the informal observations, and the curriculum interviews, a narrative description of each class was prepared. These descriptions included discussion of the activity structures utilized and of the relationships between the teacher and the students and among the students themselves. They also outlined the participation demands students experienced during the sixth grade. The target students' case descriptions (in Part B of this volume) summarize these data.

In addition, the sixth-grade teachers' ratings of their students' attributes and classroom behaviors were used to assign participation ratings to the students entering Waverley.

Finally, although the SOS was administered by the participating school districts, the EPSSP project scored the instrument for the districts, following the procedures used by Power and Cotterell (1979) and employing factor analysis techniques. After submitting the Part A items to an image factor analysis, three factors were deemed significant. The items that loaded heavily on the first factor were those items referring to the friendliness of teachers and looking forward to school each day. Hence it was assumed that this factor tapped students' feelings about school. The second factor drew together such items as "I worry about exams" and "I tense up during the discussions." It was assumed that this factor reflected students' feelings about exams. Items that loaded on the third factor included, "Nobody cares about me" and "I don't have many friends." It was assumed that this factor tapped students' feelings about relationships with their peers.

Part B of the SOS yielded six interpretable factors. The items that loaded on three of these factors pertained primarily to three discrete academic subjects: math, science, and social studies. The items that loaded on the fourth factor suggested concerns about the difficulty and clarity of schoolwork. The fifth factor drew together items that reflected feelings about teachers. Items that expressed anticipations toward junior high loaded strongly on the sixth factor.

Before writing the case descriptions, factor scores were computed for each student attending Waverley. Means and standard deviations for each factor score were then computed for the following subsamples: (1) all students in the same sixth-grade feeder classroom; (2) all students with the same sixth-grade participation ratings; and (3) all target students. Target students could thus be compared with each other, with students from their sixth-grade classroom, with students of the same participation style, and with the whole sample. These comparisons are reported in the case descriptions and provide an insight on the students' experiences and feelings about sixth grade. When appropriate and interesting, the students' reponses on the open-ended questions on the third part of the SOS are also reported in the case descriptions.

Phase II

Phase II data collection began in August 1980, before the opening of the school year. The following data sets were collected and used in the preparation of this volume: classroom observations and informal observations, student interviews, parent interviews, and teacher narrative reports. Table 4.3 itemizes the data sets to which each seventh-grade teacher contributed.

Classroom observations. Beginning on the first day of junior high school, observers were present in the classrooms of the participating teachers. The observers took notes on classroom activities in order to prepare narrative descriptions of classroom events. The observers directed their attention to the target students' participation in the lesson, interaction with the teacher, academic interaction with peers, nonacademic interaction with peers, and behavior

during seatwork. The observers also were instructed to make careful note of the activity structure in operation, teacher evaluations of academic and nonacademic behavior, and the teacher's classroom management. For the first five days of observation, the observers completed the same activity structure coding sheet used in Phase I of the study.

After the daily observations were completed each day, the observers prepared and dictated their narrative descriptions. At regular intervals during this phase of the study, the observers also prepared informal observations, commenting on the teachers' and the students' behavior as it developed over time and presenting their evaluative judgments of the students' participation in various classrooms.

As noted earlier, an effort was made to observe every student in his or her math and English classes. Due to scheduling conflicts and staffing limitations, however, it was not always possible to do so. Most of the 19 target students were observed in three of their six classes; two students were observed in four classes, and five students in two classes. These latter students were observed in only two classes for several reasons. The most common reason was that, after school began, they changed their schedules and they could not be observed in their new classes due to conflicts with the observer schedules that already were operable.

Most of the narrative descriptions focused on the target students. However, on occasion, and particularly on the first two days of school, the observers focused their attention on teachers, recording their explanations of the rules and procedures to be followed in the classroom. In all, there were 637 narrative descriptions focusing on target students (an average of 26.5 per student) and 158 focusing on teachers. In addition, observers prepared 97 informal observations of students and 55 informal observations regarding teachers. It should be noted that the observers were assigned to teachers rather than following the students from class to class.

Observations were conducted every day during the first week of school and on four of the five days of the second week of school. During the remainder of September and the first few days of October, observations occurred twice a week in each class. (By "class" is meant one period of the day. A teacher might have observations conducted in four or five periods per day.)

In November, during the week report cards for the fall quarter were distributed, classes were observed on four days (the fifth day was Veterans' Day, a holiday). As the block classes -- music, home economics, and art -- had finished in late October at the end of the first quarter, students were not observed in their block classes in November.

Student interviews. Target students were interviewed twice during Phase II. The first interviews took place in October and lasted about 30 minutes. Two students were interviewed together during this

Table 4.3

Seventh-Grade Teacher Sample Participation in Data Collection

Teacher	Classroom Observation	Self-Report Sept	Self-Report Nov	CPO on Target Students
AA	yes	no	yes	yes
AB	yes	no	no	no
AC	yes	yes	yes	yes
AD	yes	no	yes	yes
AE	yes	no	yes	yes
AF	yes*	yes	yes	yes
AG	yes°	yes	yes	yes
AH	yes	yes	yes	yes
AI	yes+	no	no	no
AJ	yes	yes	yes	yes
AK	yes*	no	yes	yes

*Block class--no November observations

°No November observations in music; observations in history in November

+No November observations as teacher withdrew from last week of the study

*Classroom participation observation

first round. The second interviews took place in November during the last week of data collection, lasted about 40 minutes, and were conducted with one student at a time. Both series of interviews took place at the school, either in the library, or in the administration wing.

All interviews were open-ended. The interviews began with inquiries about "how seventh grade is going," and proceeded to examine the differences, as the students perceived them, between sixth and seventh grade. The next main area of discussion concerned the students' experiences in their classes. We specifically asked the students to tell us about their math and English classes, although if they spontaneously talked about other classes we observed, we encouraged the students to do so. During the discussion of their classes, we probed extensively to determine the students' understanding of the grading policy, the rule system, and the availability of the teacher to help students with their work. These discussions, when combined with the narrative descriptions, provided a rich description of the students' classroom experience.

Fourteen target student interviews were conducted in October and 21 in November. Two target students, Student A12 and A20, were not willing to be interviewed. Eight others had scheduling conflicts during one of the two interview periods and could not be interviewed both times.

Teacher narrative reports. Twice during the Phase II data collection period the researchers asked the participating teachers to prepare narrative reports. These reports were dictated into a tape recorder and then transcribed. Table 4.3 listed the teachers who completed one or both reports.

In late September, the participating teachers were asked to discuss their plans for the year in the class or classes in which they were being observed. The intention was to allow the teachers as much freedom as possible in describing their instructional goals. They were asked to discuss how they organized their instruction and what they hoped their students would achieve. Also, the teachers were asked to comment on the progress of their class to date.

In November, the teachers were invited to an all-day meeting with the Far West researchers. This meeting focused on the generation of two data sets. First, the teachers were asked to comment on the progress of all the target students who were enrolled in any of their classes. These comments included, but were not restricted to, the students' academic progress, their interaction with the teacher and other students, and any anecdotal information about the students' behavior outside of class. Finally, the teachers were asked to assess the nature of the students' transitions.

Second, the teachers were asked to complete a Classroom Participation Characteristics Observation for each target student in their classes and for all the students in one of their classes. This instrument contains 21 items derived from a previous study (see Ward,

Tikunoff, Lash, Rounds & Mergendoller, 1981) and found to be important indicators of students' successful participation in classroom activities. The items focus on students' participation in academic matters, interaction with peers and teachers, and off-task activities. The following items exemplify the thrust of the CPCO: The student "attends to academic tasks," "disrupts neighbors," and "relies on peers' academic help." The 21 items are presented opposite a five-point Likert scale, which runs from "almost never" through "sometimes" to "almost always." Nine teachers and the observers completed CPCO's for the target students with whom they were familiar.

Beginning Junior High School Questionnaire. During the first week of October, seventh-graders at Waverley responded to the Beginning Junior High School Questionnaire (BJHSQ), which was administered by the collaborating school district as part of the ongoing research and evaluation efforts. This questionnaire was designed to determine the existence and strength of student concerns about their transition to junior high school. It was constructed after collecting data on the concerns actually expressed or remembered by students, parents, teachers, and administrators, when asked to reflect on the potential and actual concerns sixth-graders had as they entered junior high school. Items focused on classroom affairs, relations with teachers and peers, problems with lockers and gym, and other situations students might experience during the first weeks of school.

The BJHSQ consists of three parts. The first part, labeled "in the past," contains 32 items and asks the students to report if the item listed had been "a great concern," "a small concern," or "no concern at all" at the time they first entered junior high school. The second part of the BJHSQ, labeled "today," is identical to the first part, except that students are asked to report the level of their concern for each item on the day the questionnaire is administered.

The third portion of the questionnaire contains three open-ended questions asking the students' opinions on the similarities between sixth and seventh grade and their comments on the nature of their experience.

Parent interviews. Telephone interviews were conducted by a number of the EPSSP staff in August 1980. These interviews were semistructured. Parents were asked to discuss any concerns they had about their sons' and daughters' transitions to Waverley. Their perceptions of the the differences between junior high and elementary school were explored. Their views were sought relative to how they expected their children to respond to the new environment. Their perceptions of their children's expectations or concerns about their forthcoming junior high school experience were explored.

Data analysis. The above data sets were analyzed for use in preparation of the student case descriptions. The analysis procedures for each set are discussed in the following paragraphs.

Classroom observations. The narrative descriptions of teacher and student behavior in the classroom were read to determine the nature

of the teachers' and students' participation on each day of observation. Notations were made on the narratives whenever the teacher disciplined student behavior. Points in the narratives describing the nature of the teacher's approach to the curriculum and his or her interaction with the students also were highlighted.

The target students' academic behavior, including time on and off task, interaction with the teacher, attention to recitation, oral participation in the class, and grades, along with other indicators of achievement, was summarized. Information related to the students' interaction with peers was noted, including friendliness, academic or nonacademic contact, and frequency.

The observers' informal observations of teachers and students also were employed in preparation of the student case descriptions. These observations included observers' evaluative comments on the students' participation, actions, and conversations observed inside and outside class and judgments on consistencies and changes in student behavior observed over time.

Another area of interest in the daily narrative descriptions included the activity structures and the nature of the teacher's approach to the curriculum. Information regarding these features of each classroom are included in the case descriptions.

Student interviews. In preparation of the case descriptions, the interviews were used in a number of ways. First, they provided a rich source of data on the students' perceptions of their experiences with teachers. In addition to responding to the interviewers' questions about different teachers' rule systems, establishment of authority, classroom academic participation requirements, and students' perceptions of distributive justice in the classroom, students readily and spontaneously volunteered information about their own academic successes and failures, school problems, and the particular pleasure and disappointment they found in certain teachers' classes.

This information was carefully examined, compared with other data sets, and used to enrich our understanding of the students' seventh-grade experiences during the first two and a half months of school. In particular, the data from the interviews provided the students' perspectives on teachers and the classroom activities in which the students had participated and provided a point of triangulation for the events reported in the narrative descriptions.

Teacher narratives. Teacher narratives were used for two main purposes in the construction of the case descriptions. First, the teachers' comments about the structure of their classrooms and their plans for the year enriched our understanding of the activity structures in which students had to function. Second, their comments on the target students provided another perspective on the students' (and the teachers') participation and interactions in the classroom. Teachers' comments on the target students are reported in the case descriptions.

Classroom participation characteristics observation. As noted above, participating teachers and observers completed a CPCO for each target student with whom they were familiar. The resulting CPCO's were scored using a scoring system detailed in Ward, et al, (1981). Briefly, this scoring system establishes six criterion items found to be characteristic of each one of the six participation styles (success/multitask, social, dependent, alienate, phantom, and isolate). With this scoring system, each CPCO can be scored to determine which of these six styles of participation is applicable to a given student in a given class.

The CPCO is of special interest, as it allows the teachers' retrospective impressions to be compared with the day-to-day behavior of students as reported in the narrative descriptions. The teachers' understandings and evaluations of their students' behavior are, of course, crucial to the students' success or lack of success in school, so it is of considerable importance to learn if these evaluations are based on observable, empirical data or based on other, non-observable criteria.

The CPCO findings for each student are reported in detail in the case descriptions and in Chapter Two of this volume.

Beginning Junior High School Questionnaire. After the completion of the BJHSQ, the students' responses were recorded and analyzed. For use in the case descriptions, item responses from Part A and Part B were subjected to two separate image factor analyses. This procedure yielded five interpretable factors that were thought to be significant. The first factor includes items related to students' feelings about the difficulty or ease of doing and promptly completing schoolwork. The second factor includes items that demonstrate concern over relations with peers; especially fears of being bullied by older students. The next factor gathers together items that refer to the ease or boredom students feel in their classes and the nature of their relations with teachers. The fourth factor draws together concerns over the "newness" of junior high: lockers, undressing for gym, finding classrooms, and arriving at class on time. Items that loaded on the final factor refer to acting grown-up: meeting friends, dating, and acting like a high school student.

After completing the factor analysis, factor scores were computed for each student. Using these derived data, the type and level of individual student's concern could be compared to other students. In addition, changes in a student's concern over time could be examined, as well as the relative strength of a student's concern across the five factors. Factor scores and relevant comparisons are reported in the student case descriptions.

The third part of the questionnaire provided students with space to express their feelings about the differences between sixth and seventh grade and about the nature of their transition. These personal comments are reported in the student case descriptions as appropriate.

Parent interviews. In order to include concerns expressed by the parents of the target students, notes taken at the time of the parental interviews were examined. These concerns and the parents' perceptions of their children's anxieties and satisfactions are reported in the case descriptions.

Summary

The sample and data sets employed in preparing Parts A and B of this volume included information gathered from sixth- and seventh-grade teachers, parents, and the target students when they were in grade six and grade seven. Descriptive narrative observations of teachers and students, activity structure information, teacher, parent and student interviews, and questionnaire data served as the primary data sources. These data sets were analyzed, both discretely and by comparing them to each other. This allowed for similarities and differences in data bearing on the central experience of transition to be examined and consistencies and incongruities noted. Based on a cross-cases analysis of the case descriptions reported in Part B, the data reported earlier in this part of Volume IV were derived.

REFERENCES

Anderson, L. M., & Scott, C. The relationship among teaching methods, student characteristics, and student involvement in learning. Journal of Teacher Education, 1978, 29, 52-57.

Barnes, H. V. Physical growth and development during puberty. Medical Clinics of North America, 1975, 59, 1305-18.

Barr, R., & Dreeben, R. Instruction in classrooms. In L. S. Shulman (Ed.), Review of research in education (Vol. 5). Itasca, Ill.: F. E. Peacock, Inc., 1977.

Bauman, R., & Sherzer, J. Explorations in the ethnography of speaking. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1974.

Becker, H., Greer, B., & Hughes, E. Making the grade. New York: John Wiley, 1968.

Bossert, S. T. Activity structures and student outcomes. Paper presented at the National Institute of Education Conference on School Organization and Effects, San Diego, January 1978.

Bossert, S. T. Tasks and social relationships in classrooms: A study of classroom organization and its consequences. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1979.

Doyle, W. Student mediating responses in teaching effectiveness: NIE final report. Denton, Tex.: North Texas State University, School of Education, 1980. (NIE-6-76-0099)

Doyle, W. Classroom management and teacher decision making. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, April 1979.

Educational Research Service, Inc. Summary of research on middle schools. Arlington, VA: Author, 1977.

Eichhorn, D. H. The school. In M. Johnson (Ed.), Toward adolescence: The middle school years. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1980.

Epstein, H. T., & Toepfer, C. F., Jr. A neuroscience basis for reorganizing middle grades education. Educational Leadership, 1978, 35(8), 656-660.

Erickson, F., & Shultz, J. When is a context? ICHD Newletter, 1977, 1(2), 5-10.

Evertson, C. M., Anderson, C. W., Anderson, L. M., & Brophy, J. E. Relationships between classroom behaviors and student outcomes in junior high mathematics and English classes. American Educational Research Journal, 1980, 17(1), 43-60.

Evertson, C. M., Sanford, J. P., & Emmer, E. T. Effects of class heterogeneity in junior high school. American Educational Research Journal, 1981, 18(2), 219-232.

Fisher, C. W., Filby, N. N., Marliave, R. S., Cahen, L. S., Dishaw, M. M., Moore, J., & Berliner, D. C. Teaching behaviors, academic learning time and student achievement: Final report of Phase III-B, Beginning Teacher Evaluation Study. San Francisco: Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development, 1978.

Florio, S. Learning how to go to school: Anthropology of interaction in a kindergarten-first grade classroom. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Harvard Graduate School of Education, 1978.

Glaser, B., & Strauss, A. The discovery of grounded theory. Chicago: Aldine Publishing Company, 1967.

Good, T. L., & Power, C. N. Designing successful classroom environments for different types of students. Journal of Curriculum Studies, 1976, 8(1), 45-60.

Gumperz, J. J., & Hymes, D. (Eds.) New directions in sociolinguistics. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1974.

Konopka, G. Requirements for healthy development of adolescent youth. Adolescence, 1973, 8(2), 10-15.

Lipsitz, J. S. The age group. In M. Johnson (Ed.), The National Society for the Study of Education 1980 Yearbook. Chicago: NSSE, 1980.

Lounsbury, J. H., Marani, J. V., & Compton, M. F. The middle school in profile: A day in the seventh grade. Fairborn, Ohio: National Middle School Association, 1980.

McDermott, R. P., & Gospondinoff, K. Social contexts for ethnic borders and school failure. In A. Wolfgang (Ed.), Nonverbal behavior. Toronto: Ontario Institute for the Study of Education, 1979.

McDermott, R. P., & Roth, D. R. The social organization of behavior: Interactional approach. Annual Review of Anthropology, 1978, 7, 321-345.

Mehan, H. The competent student. Anthropology and Educational Quarterly, 1980, XI(3), 131-152.

Mehan, H. Participation structures. Working paper prepared for Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development, San Francisco, California, 1979a.

Mehan, H. Learning lessons. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1979b.

Metz, M. H. Classrooms and corridors: The crisis of authority in desegregated secondary schools. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1978.

Philips, S. Participation structures and communicative competence: War Springs children in community and classroom. In C. Cazden, V. P. John, & D. Hymes (Eds.), Functions of language in the classroom. New York: Teachers College Press, 1972.

Power, C. N. A multivariate model for studying person-environment interactions in the classroom (Tech. Rep. No. 99). Columbia: University of Missouri, Center for Research in Social Behavior, 1974.

Power, C., & Cotterell, J. Students in transition. Adelaide, South Australia: The Flinders University of South Australia, School of Education, 1979.

Samples, R. The metaphoric mind. Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley Publishing Co., 1976, p. 87.

Sanches, M., & Blount, B. Socio-cultural dimensions of language use. New York: Academic Press, 1975.

Sanford, J. P., & Evertson, C. M. Classroom management in a low SES junior high: Three case studies. Journal of Teacher Education, 1981, 32(1), 34-38.

Shuy, R. W., & Griffin, P. (Eds.) The study of children's functional language and education in the early years (Final Report to the Carnegie Corporation of New York). Arlington, Va.: Center for Applied Linguistics, 1978.

Soar, Robert, & Soar, Ruth A process-product approach to teachers' sense of efficacy. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Education Research Association, New York, March 1982.

Ward, B. A., Tikunoff, W. J., Lash, A. A., Rounds, T. S., & Mergendoller, J. R. Ecological perspectives for successful schooling practice: Student participation characteristics. San Francisco: Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development, 1981.